DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 220 549 UD 022 477

AUTHOR Bossone, Richard M., Ed.
TITLE Proceedings: The Conference of the University/Urban Schools National Task Force: What Works in Urban Schools (3rd, San Francisco, CA, July 9-10, 1982).
INSTITUTION City Univ. of New York, N.Y. Center for Advanced Study in Education.
REPORT NO CASE-03-82
PUB DATE Jul 82
NOTE 89p.; For related documents see ED 212 730. Some pages in attachments may be marginally legible due to poor quality of print in original document.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Board of Education Role; Cognitive Processes; College School Cooperation; *Community Support; *Educational Administration; *Educational Improvement; *Educational Planning; Elementary Secondary Education; Equal Education; Management Development; *Personnel Evaluation; Postsecondary Education; *School Business Relationship; School Community Relationship; *School Effectiveness; Superintendents; Teaching Methods; Urban Education
IDENTIFIERS Detroit Public Schools MI; Minneapolis Public Schools MN; Saint Louis City School District MO

ABSTRACT

Proceedings of the University/Urban Schools Task Force conference on what works in urban schools are summarized in this report. The future direction of the Task Force, articulated by conference participants, is described as a move toward the conceptualization and design of programs to teach thinking skills versus programs that mainly teach subject content. The report also includes three conference papers discussing elements of successful urban school programs. In the first paper, Superintendent Richard Green (Minneapolis Public Schools, Minnesota) describes Minneapolis' Five-Year Plan to promote equity and excellence. The Plan emphasizes maximization of learning opportunities; staff performance appraisal; and involvement of the Board of Education, the community, and business and labor sectors in program planning and implementation. In the second paper, Superintendent Arthur Jefferson (Detroit Public Schools, Michigan) discusses his district's experience in designing and implementing two administrative staff evaluation systems, and describes seminars provided by the Detroit Public Schools Management Academy to improve administrative staff performance. In the last paper, Superintendent Ronald Stodghill (Saint Louis Public Schools, Missouri) describes the Saint Louis School Partnership Program in order to demonstrate the advantages of mutual support between schools and business, culture, and the universities in a community. (MJL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED220549

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
L. Cohen
CUNY-CASE
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Proceedings

The Third Conference of the University/Urban Schools National Task Force: What Works in Urban Schools

July 9 & 10, 1982
San Francisco

Edited by
Richard M. Bossone

Center for Advanced Study in Education
The Graduate School and University Center
of the City University of New York

Case 03-82
1982

UD 022 417

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION 1

PARTICIPANTS 9

THREE REPORTS

Equality and Excellence: A Five-Year Plan for Minneapolis Public Schools
Richard R. Green . . . 11

Designing and Implementing Administrative Staff Evaluation Systems to Improve Performance: The Detroit Public Schools Experience
Arthur Jefferson . . . 27

The St. Louis School Partnership Program: A Local Solution to a National Problem
Ronald Stodghill . . . 63

INTRODUCTION

Lorin W. Anderson
Professor and Assistant Dean
College of Education
University of South Carolina

The Third Conference of the University/Urban Schools National Task Force had a dual focus. First, the dialogue on what works in urban schools, which formed the basis for the first two conferences, was continued. Second, the future direction of the Task Force was discussed. The two sections of this introduction reflect this dual focus.

Reports on What Works in Urban Schools

Papers were presented by Dr. Richard Green, Superintendent of the Minneapolis Public Schools; Dr. Arthur Jefferson, General Superintendent of the Detroit Public Schools; and Dr. Ronald Stodghill, Interim Superintendent of the St. Louis Public Schools. In combination, these papers address three critical features of successful school programs: planning, monitoring, and support.

Dr. Green reminds us that successful school programs are planned; they do not just happen. According to Dr. Green, plans must be clearly stated, understandable, realistic, and action-oriented if they are to be properly implemented and, ultimately, effective. The Five-Year Plan for Minneapolis Public Schools is such a plan.

Several other crucial aspects of plans and planning can be gleaned from Dr. Green's paper. First, there is a major distinction between

planning and plans. Put simply, planning is a process; plans are products. Planning provides opportunities for the involvement of many interested parties. As a result, planning should lead to a feeling of ownership on the part of those who participate in the planning process. Plans, on the other hand, are intended to provide needed stability to the institutions and agencies seeking them. This stability is not achieved, however, at the expense of meaningful, needed change. Rather the parameters of change are built into the plans themselves. In this way, change becomes planned change.

One of the major implications of Dr. Jefferson's paper is that the implementation of plans must be monitored. One aspect of such monitoring is the evaluation of those individuals who are responsible for the implementation of the plans (e.g., central office administrators, principals, and teachers). If evaluation is to improve implementation, however, the evaluation system must address several issues not currently addressed by many evaluation systems. Three such issues are covered by Dr. Jefferson in his discussion of administrative staff evaluation.

First, the nature of what is being evaluated must be specified. Global personality traits must be replaced by specific, clearly defined leadership skills. Second, the evaluation must be fair and impartial. In the Detroit Public Schools, fairness is increased by permitting administrators to set their own goals (provided they are aligned with the district goals) and determine the standards of performance that will be used to judge the accomplishment of those goals. Third, those being evaluated must be provided with opportunities to correct or overcome the

weaknesses identified by the evaluation system. Dr. Jefferson uses the term "formative" to refer to this last component of his administrative staff evaluation system.

Dr. Stodghill's paper suggests that plans must receive support from a number of sources if they are to be implemented as effectively as they might be. In St. Louis, part of this support comes from the establishment of partnerships with businesses, universities, and cultural institutions. Partnership programs provide emotional support, instructional support, and financial support for public schools. All three types of support are necessary for the successful implementation of plans.

Partnerships, of course, are mutually beneficial. In addition to the support schools receive from the surrounding community, businesses along with universities and cultural institutions ultimately benefit from the success of school programs of this type. Businesses can begin to rely on better educated and informed employees. Cultural institutions can expect an increased number of patrons to emerge from public schools with such programs. In his paper, Dr. Stodghill outlines the steps involved in the creation of workable partnership programs.

Future Direction of the Task Force

A substantial portion of the discussion at this Conference was concerned with the future direction of the Task Force. During the previous Conference, the possibility of moving toward the design and implementation of programs for the improvement of thinking skills of

public school students was discussed briefly. At this Conference, the discussion was continued and expanded.

The concern for teaching students how to think stems largely from an awareness of the difficulty many students experience when moving from high school to college. The College Board, aware of this difficulty, developed Project Equality. The core of Project Equality lies in the delineation of six sets of competencies: reading, writing, speaking/listening, mathematics, reasoning, and study skills. Dr. Dan Taylor, Senior Vice President of College Board, conveyed to the conference participants the intent of College Board to provide support for, and participate in, the development of programs focusing on the improvement of the thinking and reasoning skills of high school students (i.e., students enrolled in grades 7 through 12).

The magnitude of the problem of moving toward the teaching of thinking can be seen by examining a fairly traditional two-dimensional table (see Table 1).

Table 1

Table of Content and Mental Operations

Content	Mental Operations										
	Recall	Recognize	Classify	Estimate	Interpret	Apply	Analyze	Organize	Formulate	Evaluate	Decide
Terms											
Concepts											
Facts											
Principles											
Rules											
Techniques											
Methods											

The rows of the table represent the content which students are exposed to and expected to learn. Regardless of the particular subject matter being taught, students are expected to acquire a vast array of terms, concepts, facts, principles, rules, techniques, and fairly specific methods. This array of content becomes the knowledge students have of a particular subject matter. That is, content translates into what students know about natural science, social studies, mathematics, reading, and the like.

The columns of the table represent the mental (or cognitive) operations that students can perform on or with the content. Content can be recalled, classified, interpreted, organized, evaluated, and so on. These operations are synonymous with what are typically referred to as thinking skills. Thinking skills, within this conceptual framework, are important for at least two reasons. First, they equip students to deal more effectively with the complexity of everyday life. Second, they enable students to gain new knowledge in the form of new content, that is, to learn more about natural science, social studies, mathematics, and reading. Thus, thinking skills are beneficial to students from both a practical and academic perspective.

The move toward thinking skills being considered by the Task Force is a move toward a more balanced treatment of content and mental operations. Such a move is not intended to disregard or downplay the importance of content. Indeed, a renewed attention to content quite likely accounts for a large part of the improvement in student achievement being noticed in urban schools today. Rather, the move toward the teaching of thinking is intended to help educators focus on the most essential content, and, using this content, help students develop the thinking skills necessary to acquire new content, interrelate new content with previously learned content, use both new and previously learned content to deal more effectively and efficiently with everyday and academic problems, and select the most important content to learn in the future.

A number of approaches to the teaching of thinking currently exist. Several were mentioned and described briefly at this Conference.

Ms. Charlotte Frank, Executive Director of the Division of Curriculum and Instruction, New York City Schools, discussed three approaches currently in place in the New York City Schools. One approach is based on Bloom's Taxonomy of Cognitive Objectives and primarily involves teaching teachers effective ways of asking questions which require students to think rather than to rely on simply recalling relevant prior learning. A second approach is based on Guilford's Structure of the Intellect. Guilford's Structure of the Intellect adds a third dimension to the two dimensions of Table 1. This third dimension corresponds with the nature of the response (product) made by the students after they perform some type of mental operation on some type of content. A third approach is one developed by Feuerstein. Called Instrumental Enrichment, this approach emphasizes thinking by de-emphasizing the academic nature of the content contained in the tasks presented to the students. Specially developed materials are available for implementing the Guilford and Feuerstein approaches.

Count Michael de Saint-Arnaud, Honorary Director of the CoRT Foundation, U.S.A., briefly described the Edward de Bono approach to the teaching of thinking. The de Bono approach is based on the teaching of a set of discrete thinking skills in an effort to help students develop what he calls "lateral thinking" (that is, seeking to solve problems by unorthodox or apparently illogical methods). As in the case of the Feuerstein approach, content demands on the students are decreased by permitting students to use whatever content they currently have available as they engage in the thinking process. Once again materials have been

developed to aid in the implementation of the de Bono approach.

At the conclusion of the discussion, the conference participants endorsed a move toward the teaching of thinking. Following this endorsement, Dr. Richard M. Bossone, Chairman of the Task Force, stated that he would be working with College Board personnel to obtain a grant to support this move. All agreed that this would be a worthwhile endeavor because the future of American urban education lies in the development of thoughtful and thinking students.

UNIVERSITY/URBAN SCHOOLS NATIONAL TASK FORCE

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

Chairman

Dr. Richard M. Bossone
University Dean for Instructional Research
Graduate School and University Center
City University of New York

Secretary

Dr. Max Weiner
Dean
Graduate School of Education
Fordham University

Members

Dr. Lorin W. Anderson
Professor and Assistant Dean
College of Education
University of South Carolina

Dr. Orpen Bryant
Associate Superintendent
Chicago Public Schools

Dr. John L. Crew, Sr.
Superintendent
Baltimore Public Schools

Dr. Richard R. Green
Superintendent
Minneapolis Public Schools

Dr. Willie W. Herenton
Superintendent
Memphis Public Schools

Dr. Arthur Jefferson
Superintendent
Detroit Public Schools

Dr. Stanley A. Schainker
Associate Superintendent
San Francisco Public Schools

Dr. Robert R. Spillane
Superintendent
Boston Public Schools

Dr. Ronald Stodghill
Interim Superintendent
St. Louis Public Schools

Participants

Ms. Carol B. Choye
Curriculum Coordinator
San Francisco Public Schools

Count Michael de Saint-Arnaud
CoRT Foundation

Ms. Charlotte Frank
Executive Director
Division of Curriculum and Instruction
New York City Public Schools

Ms. Janie Noble
CoRT Foundation

Dr. Dan Taylor
Senior Vice President
College Board

Observers

Ms. Muriel Cohen
Education Columnist
The Boston Globe

Mr. William Grant
Education Columnist
The San Francisco Chronicle

Mr. Charles Hardy
Education Columnist
The San Francisco Examiner

EQUALITY AND EXCELLENCE: A FIVE-YEAR PLAN FOR MINNEAPOLIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Richard R. Green
Superintendent
Minneapolis Public Schools

Introduction

Changes in Minneapolis mirror changes throughout the cities of America. Population decline in the central city has stimulated intense concern about keeping a diverse resident population, including young middle-class families, in the inner cities. Sociological change has required the school system to take on a broad range of responsibilities which have previously been assigned to the family. Demographic change has required continuous adaptation of the desegregation/integration program. Declining pupil enrollment has forced continuous adjustments in the roster of facilities and personnel. In addition, tight resources have forced the school district to look at ways of "doing more with less." In Minneapolis, the pressures of change have been channeled through the framework of a comprehensive Five-Year Plan to produce purposeful reorganization of the public school system.

Confronted by a number of business and citizen groups demanding that the school district substitute strategic planning for uncertainty and instability, the Minneapolis Board of Education committed the district to long-range planning at the time it hired a new superintendent in 1980. Now, two years later, after hundreds of hours spent in work sessions, the Board has approved a Five-Year Plan, including a companion document, which builds

a continuous cycle of implementation, evaluation, and ongoing planning into the district's normal pattern of activity.

The Minneapolis plan is comprehensive in that it affects all elements of the public school system. It is strategic in that it makes decisions regarding the key actions required to accomplish the mission of the organization. It is long range in that it will be continually updated within a five-year range of projections to allow adaption to changing conditions or expectations. I believe that it is our city's last major statement in this century about the shape of education required for students who will guide societal change in the 21st century.

The Essence of the Plan

In essence, the task of planning is simple. Whether large or small, public or private, every institution is required to answer the question: "How can we best organize our people and capital to get the job done?" Planning is the tool used to develop the answer. Effectiveness and efficiency are the criteria by which the resulting organization will be judged.

After lengthy consideration, the Minneapolis Board of Education has defined its K-12 mission in one paragraph. Put simply, the mission statement guarantees every student equal access to a superior educational program that will challenge him or her to reach his/her highest intellectual potential, while at the same time assuring achievement of a clearly defined and measurable set of common basic skills. According to the Minneapolis definition, the basic skills include the communication

skills of reading, writing, speaking, viewing, and listening; the problem solving skills of math and science including technological literacy; effective studying skills; and citizenship skills necessary for living in a changing society.

All the district's resources will be focused on the classroom in order to fulfill the educational mission. The classroom teacher is the manager of learning. The principal is the leader who must manage resources within the school building to support classroom learning. The administrators and support personnel of the school district are the providers of resources that support classroom learning.

The administrative organizational system has been reorganized to encourage flexible, grass-roots management in the school buildings, with principals accountable to the central office. The "what" will be decided centrally but the "how to" will be decided in the individual work unit, the school. Participative site-based management will be encouraged, involving all of the building's staff and the school-community in decisions about how to achieve city-wide objectives.

This pattern of decision making should result in an organization which is both cost effective and flexible, maintaining the central control necessary for accountability while allocating authority to the building staff to adapt available resources in order to maximize productivity and improve the climate for classroom learning.

Equity and Excellence

Diversity is the greatest strength of the Minneapolis Public Schools.

Minneapolis, the largest school district in Minnesota, has over 40,000 students, who speak 50 different languages, in kindergarten through the post-secondary vocational program. It has over 6,000 full- and part-time staff in more than 300 different job classifications. And it has many partners in the community helping students share the diverse resources of the Twin Cities: tutors, speakers, and a multitude of financial contributors. The challenge is to build on the strengths in order to achieve the equity and educational excellence promised in the district's mission statement.

Equity and excellence mean the public schools hold high expectations for the achievement of every student. Individual achievement, defined in terms of specific K-12 interdisciplinary learning objectives for each of the basic skills, will be monitored through locally developed criterion-referenced tests, as well as national norm-referenced tests. Social promotion will be eliminated when it means that a student is advanced through the grade system without regard to his/her achievement of basic skills. Promotional "gates" will make mandatory the achievement, up to expectations, at certain grade levels. Special help will be given through intervention strategies to students who do not measure up to expectations so that they can proceed to the next set of learning objectives.

On the other hand, special challenges will be offered for gifted students through enriched programs in every school. Students seeking challenges in particular subjects will be able to enroll in senior high magnet schools. Enrollment in such schools means that students have access to specialized courses and activities beyond the regular comprehensive

program. The seven special programs for 1982-83 include an Automotive Magnet, a Business and Service Occupations Magnet, a Summa-Tech Magnet in Science/Math and Technology, a Technical Occupations Magnet, a Visual and Performing Arts Magnet, a Radio Broadcasting Magnet in which students operate a 20-hour-a-day FM radio station, and a Central Magnet program with an enriched curriculum for gifted students.

Equity also means that everyone in the Minneapolis Public Schools, whether administrator, bus driver, clerk, teacher, or student, shares the responsibility for establishing a climate for learning that is safe, structured, caring, challenging, and supportive. The unique qualities of every student will be valued. Every student will be treated fairly and with dignity. Multi-ethnic learning materials and activities will be part of every classroom curriculum. Orderly behavior throughout the school system will be required and enforced by building and city-wide discipline policies.

Equity carries another meaning: opportunities must be maximal throughout the school system. This requires a well-rounded curriculum of course offerings in every one of the 50 schools in the district. In the senior high schools, for example, 78 courses will be available as the minimum program offering beginning fall, 1982, and each school will be permitted to add other electives. In elementary schools, principals will be required to monitor program balance, as defined by our city-wide teachers' advisory committee, to ensure that the average student is not sacrificed in order to support either the high need or the gifted student.

Educational excellence requires the school system to hold high

expectations for every staff person as well as for every student. The district is developing performance appraisal systems to cover all categories of the system's personnel and is individualizing staff development programs to round out and update skills. Fifteen schools will be piloting Richard Manatt's School Improvement Model for appraisal of teachers and principals. Beginning this summer, the school system will negotiate an annual agreement with every principal regarding expectations for building performance, to be used as the basis for appraisal of individual school performance. Next fall, a management reporting system will be instituted to appraise the annual performance of department managers. Finally, performance indicators will be established to appraise the achievements of the school system as a whole.

Moreover, educational excellence cannot happen without parent involvement in student learning and school affairs. Therefore, communication and participation are both elements of the Five-Year Plan. An open, two-way system of communication will be established to foster respect and trust. Parent handbooks, school newsletters and catalogs, plus phone and conference contacts, will help increase parent involvement in student learning. Every principal will be held responsible for involving representative parents and staff in a school advisory council to ensure involvement in planning and evaluating programs. This fall, two conferences will be held: one on Parent Partnerships and one on Student Partnerships, to establish ways of improving one-to-one parent involvement in student learning and of increasing responsible student participation in school affairs.

Minneapolis Public Schools intend to be competitive, not only in the quality of classroom education, but also in the support services provided to meet student and parent needs. In order to attract and keep students in the public schools, it is essential that we meet parents' needs with programs similar to Latch Key, which provides before-and-after school care for the children of working parents.

It is also essential to keep ahead of the game by planning ways to meet future needs. Minneapolis Public Schools plan to allocate personnel and capital resources to ensure literacy in information technology for staff and students. With assistance from local industry, plans are being made to develop technology programs to prepare students for the 21st century. An important objective is to have a computer in every classroom by 1986, and to institute basic technological literacy training for all school staff.

I stressed diversity as the major strength of Minneapolis Public Schools. The district has different programs to match the learning needs of every age group from infants to senior citizens, with parenting classes and preschool programs, with elementary through senior high school programs, and with post-secondary and community education programs.

I believe that by offering six different teaching/learning styles, our K-12 program alternatives provide, in their diversity, a good answer to critics demanding educational vouchers.

. In the Fundamentals program, students are in graded, self-contained classrooms where one teacher directs all activities, stressing basic skills. Parents sign an agreement as to the

policies of the program, including strict discipline and homework policies.

- In the Contemporary program, students are grouped in graded classrooms where a single teacher directs most of the learning.
- In the Continuous Progress program, students move among ungraded groups based upon their skills and interests, and a team of teachers directs student learning.
- In the Montessori program, which requires special teacher training, students work in small ungraded groups using special Montessori materials for self-teaching.
- In the Free School program, teachers are advisors who help students make individual learning agreements for classes, projects, and outside activities.
- In the Open program (K only), students two to five years old plan their own time, working as members of an ungraded family. The teacher, along with parents and community volunteers, guides children in learning, individually and in small groups.

The objective of the program alternatives is to fit the educational style to the individual student learning style and to parent values and belief systems.

Diversity is the major strength of the Minneapolis Public Schools. Equity and educational excellence are its goals. The Five-Year Plan builds on the district's strengths to achieve its educational mission.

A Workable Process

So far, I have discussed the content of the Five-Year Plan. The lessons to be learned by other school districts from the Minneapolis experience, however, may concern the planning process rather than its product. If you had watched our local television during the last six months, you would not have heard about the educational mission of the plan but about one of its by-products, that is, the closing of 18 school facilities, including three senior high schools, at the end of this school year. Along with the school closings come changes in school boundaries and grade organization that affect every student and school in Minneapolis. With more students of every ethnic and racial background in various classes, equity has finally been achieved through the city-wide impact of our desegregation/integration plan.

The Board of Education's vote on school closings was the same as on the total Five-Year Plan: 7 to 0. This unanimity resulted from the structure of the decision-making process. By the time the Board members faced the harsh choices on facilities, which would be expected to disrupt the community, they had a clear sense of direction regarding program, personnel, and organization that helped them through the turmoil. If they had looked at facilities and desegregation decisions outside of the context of a comprehensive plan, or at the beginning of the process, they could not have withstood public pressures that surround school closings and changes in attendance area boundaries.

I recently received a "Plan for Planning" from the superintendent of a large urban school district. In it, his associate describes a process

of working with the staff and community to "develop goals for the school system, which will then be approved by the Board of Education." I would suggest that this process will produce little change because it does not accommodate the political truth of all school districts: the members of a Board of Education are elected to bear the full responsibility for the performance of the public schools in meeting the educational needs of the district's constituency. Effective school planning requires Board ownership of policy decisions. Input from the community is needed, but the Board itself must work through the development of goal statements which will determine budget priorities and a host of other policy decisions.

An essential part of getting the Board of Education committed to planning was a seminar for the Board and Superintendent's Cabinet presented in 1980 by a few local planners under the aegis of the Greater Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce. The workshop included several group dynamic exercises, not only to bring participants closer together, but also to give the Board members the sense that their authority would be kept intact through the planning process. They then understood that planning was not only an exercise in drawing wall-sized diagrams or a technique for rallying community groups, but also a useful tool for directing some needed changes.

In Minneapolis, the Board of Education believes that it owns the planning process as well as the product of the Five-Year Plan. Presented with alternatives, the Board members, in February, 1981, decided on a planning process, a four-cycle process which would allow the Board to make tentative decisions about one set of issues before moving on to

another set. The Board members considered the question of who should be involved in preparing presentations on individual topics. They decided that they did not want to be lobbied by citizens participating on planning teams before they themselves had a chance to hear the presentation. Further, they decided that planning teams made up of staff and outside experts would prepare Discussion Packages on each of 13 topics to be presented first to the Board for discussion and immediately thereafter to the community for response. Responses would be reported to the Board and used by the planning teams to develop elements of the plan. The Board would then review and revise a group of plan elements at the end of each planning cycle. Three cycles would produce the three parts of the plan and the fourth cycle would be used to produce an implementation plan.

If the Board of Education made the planning decisions, who analyzed the problems and framed alternative approaches to accomplishing the mission? The staff. A helpful by-product of the planning process has been greater clarification of the separation of powers between the Board and administration.

In Minneapolis, staff responsibility for each planning team's effort was assigned at the top to one of the seven members of the Superintendent's Cabinet, with the total burden shared equally among them. This assignment of authority guaranteed the district's commitment of adequate time and resources to the planning process. Again, the issue of ownership was important. Each team leader was asked to involve members who would be carrying out the activities finally directed by the Board and Superintendent. The resulting membership varied in size from 15 to 150 among the

13 planning teams.

Because the Minneapolis school district had no history of comprehensive planning, outside assistance was needed to guide the Board, staff, and community through the planning process. Supported by a $100,000 grant from the business community, raised by the Greater Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce, the district hired a planning coordinator who had been Deputy Planning Director for the City of Minneapolis and who also had experience as an employee of the Minneapolis Public Schools, conducting a research and evaluation project in the early 1970s. She insisted that her title be coordinator rather than planner. "I've seen what happens when consultants come in and plan. Their work tends to get put on a shelf when they leave. Ownership is the issue. If the Board and staff feel they have done the work and really own the plan, I can walk out at the end of my 16-month contract and no one will notice because I will no longer be needed as a catalyst to get things moving." Coordinator she was, but her sense of direction and her ability to pull together all of the overlapping elements of the plan into coherent documents were essential to the success of the planning process.

The Board makes the decisions. The staff does the work. Who must buy into the plan to make implementation possible? The business community, the labor community, and the community-at-large. As stated by Willard Wirtz, the former U. S. Secretary of Labor: "Schools that become isolated from the rest of the community become isolated from the knowledge of what it takes for youth to participate in those other institutions, from how employers view the developed abilities provided by the schools, from the

resources throughout a community for enriching and extending the educational process, and from the reserve of good will potentially available for furthering educators' objectives, recently buffeted by public discontent and criticism."

Fortunately, Minneapolis has a Chamber of Commerce with a history of involvement in education through assistance for specific curriculum programs, career guidance for teachers and students, and a partnership program between individual schools and specific companies. At the time the Chamber of Commerce committed the money to help the district "construct a vision of excellence for the future and a plan for achieving that goal," its chairman explained the commitment by saying: "The quality of the Minneapolis Public Schools is critical to the development of our neighborhoods, our businesses, and to the entire metropolitan area. It influences our quality of life far beyond any other organization. It has anchored the health of this city in an important way."

I asked the business community, however, for more than money in this planning process; namely, I asked for corporate advisors. These advisors have made an important difference in the work of our Organization, Personnel, Technology, and Finance planning teams. The Honeywell Corporation has worked with us to develop the new Summa-Tech Magnet School for Science/Math and Technology. Now we are working with several corporations on activities to implement the Five-Year Plan: a Management Training Institute for principals; an Adopt-a-School program of school-business partnership; a marketing plan for the school district; and pilot dropout prevention programs.

Without the cooperation of the labor community, the school district could never have achieved the massive staff reassignments required by the closing of one-quarter of our school facilities. During the month of May, approximately 3,000 certificated staff were reassigned in open bidding sessions structured through negotiated agreement with the Minneapolis Federation of Teachers. The teachers' union, and through it the broader labor community, has strongly supported the plan in spite of criticism from members harmfully affected by its implementation. Why? Because they see that we are cutting back on bricks and mortar in order to concentrate our funds on the staff who provide the programs. In spite of a predicted two-percent decline in pupil enrollment and punishing budget cuts, Minneapolis Public Schools do not expect any teacher layoffs this year, thanks to savings accruing from school closings along with a reduction in reserves and the benefits of high interest rates on investments.

It has also been important for the district to involve the community-at-large in consideration of our vision of the educational future. If we are going to maintain grass-roots support for public education, we must define the school-community as the total community. Because only 17 percent of the households in Minneapolis have children of public school age, the Minneapolis Public Schools need tax dollars from every household. Therefore, Minneapolis Public Schools have gone beyond the parents of school children in the process of involvement, a tactic not always appreciated by our parent advisory groups.

Minneapolis Public Schools have tried to involve the total community

in the planning process through distribution, to every household, of fact sheets with response forms on plan development; through the citizen advisory committees in neighborhoods; and through the city-wide citizen organizations, such as the Urban Coalition, Urban League, Citizens Committee on Public Education, and League of Women Voters. Every district needs community partnerships in planning to make the process work.

But more needs to be done to get across the message that the Minneapolis Public Schools provide services for every city resident from preschoolers through senior citizens. We must be able to show that public schools are effective and efficient in guaranteeing student learning achievement. And we must demonstrate our achievement in easily understood language through the local and national media.

Educators have not tended to exhibit marketing awareness. It is difficult for them to see community residents as potential clients, whose degree of commitment to the public schools will either create or eliminate educators' jobs. Educators tend to work with students who show up, without worrying about those who attend a nonpublic school or move away. In Minneapolis, relationships with the business community have helped us to understand the need for a client orientation. Minneapolis Public Schools are working now on a marketing campaign to reach the parents of preschoolers, to reach the parents of nonpublic students, and to reach the community-at-large. Fortunately, a major advertising agency has offered its services to support a public service campaign. Community partnerships are essential to achieving our vision of the future.

Plan for Action

There is no point to planning unless it is action oriented. A school district can go through all the rational, goal-oriented planning that you or I could conjure up, but it will matter little five years from now unless the plan's objectives are properly implemented. To foster proper implementation, the objectives must be

(1) clearly defined in terms of specific actions;

(2) realistic in that they are attainable;

(3) understood in that they are known to all members of the organization;

(4) effective in that they guide action, evaluation, and budget development; and

(5) effective in that they match up with the personal and professional goals of the district's personnel.

I believe that the Minneapolis Five-Year Plan meets these criteria. Wait a few years and we will provide you with a report about its impact.

DESIGNING AND IMPLEMENTING ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF EVALUATION SYSTEMS TO IMPROVE PERFORMANCE: THE DETROIT PUBLIC SCHOOLS EXPERIENCE

Arthur Jefferson
General Superintendent
Detroit Public Schools

Introduction

The call for improved management echoes across the nation. In business, industry, government, and labor, recognition of the need has been pronounced, especially in these hard economic times. More recently, the recognition is apparent in school system after school system, whether large or small, urban or rural. The awareness stems from the following: (1) demands for more efficient, productive utilization of resources, (2) repeated studies of school effectiveness which highlight the significance of educational leadership, especially that of school principals, and (3) increasing requests of administrators for training in management.

Considerable public attention is now being directed toward school administrators and much of it is expressed in bitterness and dissatisfaction. Multiple expectations are held for school administrators: they must please students, teachers, parents, other administrators, school board members, community leaders, and themselves. And with each constituent category there are further divisions of expectations. In many situations, especially at the individual school level, effective management has become increasingly difficult.

Until recently, the Detroit school system paid relatively little

attention to assessing or to improving the quality of educational management. It was assumed that good teachers made good administrators and that good principals made good system-wide managers. That assumption was sheltered through administrative tenure statutes and administrative certification credentializing systems. Central and regional office administrators have been drawn from building positions with equally rigid traditions.

Serving as a classroom teacher, completing college-level school administration courses, and passing an interview conducted by potential immediate supervisors were the requirements for promotion to the administrative ranks. Once an administrator obtained the position, evaluations, if conducted at all, were at best subjective and annual. In addition to tenure statues and credentializing systems, the job security of administrators was also sheltered by the trepidation with which immediate supervisors, superintendents, and board members approached evaluation, with a nebulous fear of violating a colleague's rights to due process.

We assumed that, based upon teaching experience and some training, central office and school administrators could effectively manage. We assumed that they knew and understood (1) the basic functions and activities of management, (2) effective participatory problem solving and decision making methods, (3) effects of personal supervision and leadership styles on subordinates, (4) methods of conflict resolution, (5) how to manage fiscal and human resources, (6) how to manage time, delegate, and plan, (7) how to communicate effectively, (8) how to work successfully with staff to set and accomplish goals and objectives, and (9) how to work effectively

with regional and central school board members, parents, local community leaders, and school councils. We further assumed that they were willing to share the control of schools with students, parents, faculties, union representatives, community leaders, regional and central office personnel, and board members; were in tune with changes in society and the surrounding environment; were knowledgeable about major social, political, and economic themes that were emerging in their midst; and were able to effect responsible educational decisions in a proactive rather than a reactive manner. Unfortunately, these assumptions were unfounded and we had to reconsider our approach to selecting and training school administrators.

Purpose

Approximately 1,200 administrators in Detroit Public Schools have an average of twenty years of management service left in their careers. This adds up to nearly 25,000 educational leadership years. The intent of this paper is to describe the efforts underway in Detroit to evaluate and improve the quality of administrative services in those 250 centuries of work.

The attention of the Detroit public school system has been focused primarily upon developing and implementing a fair administrative staff evaluation system that would improve administrative functioning, namely, one that would be formative. Toward that end, fair and formative Administrative and Supervisory Performance Appraisal and Executive Performance Review Systems have been implemented; a training center, our

Management Academy, has been established; and an Assessment Center concept for prospective principals has been pilot-tested and made ready for implementation. Supplementary descriptive materials for each activity have been provided in attachments augmenting the summary statements contained in this paper.

Programs Designed to Improve Administrator Performance Through Evaluation

During this past school year, two evaluation systems for administrators were implemented in Detroit. The first, the Administrative and Supervisory Performance Appraisal System, was designed to promote a fair, formative evaluation of all but the highest ranking administrative personnel. The second, the Executive Performance Review System, was designed to provide a similar evaluation of people in approximately 25 key administrative positions.

The replaced system had rated principals and other administrators from outstanding to unsatisfactory in five performance areas (1) appraising, analyzing, and decision making; (2) relationships and communications; (3) planning, organizing, and implementing; (4) leadership coordinating and influencing; and (5) authority-responsibility and evaluation. The following chart, which summarizes the ratings given to Detroit administrators by their superiors over a one year period, illustrates how an evaluation system which is subjective and lacks specific goals, objectives, and performance standards will become overrun by rampant inflation that defeats the purpose of the evaluation system and renders the results almost useless. Seventy-nine percent of the administrators were rated outstanding; 97 percent were rated good or better; fewer than one percent were rated marginal; and not one was rated unsatisfactory.

DETROIT PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Office of Personnel

ADMINISTRATIVE RATINGS
1977-1978

Possible Ratings = 1,239
Ratings Submitted = 1,050 (85%)

Title	Outstanding	Good	Satisfactory	Marginal	Unsatisfactory
Principal	176	21		1	
Assistant Principal	194	32	12		
Curricular Leader	1	1			
Staff Coordinator	36	8	1		
Unit Head/ Department Head	231	48	7	2	
Regional Assistant	11	1			
Divisional Director	1	2			
Director	11	6			
Assistant Director	32	8	2		
Administrative Assistant	29	12			
Junior Administrative Assistant	45	25	4		
Technical Administrative Assistant		4	1		
Research Associate	5	1			
Research Assistant	13	1	2	1	
Supervisor	36	15	2		
Coordinator		2			
Physical Plant Manager	6	1			
TOTAL = 1,050	827 (79%)	188 (18%)	31 (3%)	4 (0%)	

Administrative and Supervisory Performance Appraisal and Executive Performance Review Systems

Administrative and Supervisory Performance Appraisal System

A comprehensive "administrative and supervisory performance appraisal system" was recently incorporated into the collective bargaining agreement with the union, representing virtually all administrators and supervisors. The performance appraisal system calls for mutual establishment of performance standards for both appraiser and appraisee. The standards are integrally related to the objectives of the school system as a whole, the appraiser's particular administrative unit, and the appraisee's position description. In addition, the appraisee identifies personal development performance standards.

This approach to performance appraisal provides the total management team with a mechanism for keeping staff motivated, interested, and committed. This system will realize its full potential when all managers begin to practice appropriate coaching, counseling, and interpersonal skills. This performance appraisal system is not only a means to improve the quality of educational services but also can become a personnel development experience for those involved.

An extensive training and orientation program has been developed in support of this new appraisal system. Each administrator develops a "position description" which contains a clear definition of broad areas of responsibility and delineates reporting and supervisory relationships. Standards of performance are developed jointly by the appraiser and appraisee for each area of responsibility. Performance appraisal

interviews are conducted periodically. Performance standards which are not being met are discussed in terms of whether or not they are realistically attainable and in terms of availability of support needed to reduce barriers to attainment.

Such a plan means the following: (1) effective interviews will result in information about the appraisee's strengths, areas in need of additional development, and the appraisee's future potential; (2) collaborative development of a plan for improvement, including support from the appraiser and the use of effective coaching and counseling techniques, will enable the appraisee to understand his or her responsibility for self-improvement and what assistance can be provided; (3) for the successful appraisee, training will focus on preparation for more challenging positions, projects, and future assignments; (4) for the unsuccessful appraisee, training and/or special assignments will focus on remedying deficiences. See Attachment 1.

Executive Performance Review System

The Executive Performance Review System is an administrative performance appraisal system designed for the key administrative leadership (approximately 25 positions, including the General Superintendent). Its procedures and purposes are similar to the Administrative and Supervisory Performance Appraisal System described above.

At the beginning of each school year, the General Superintendent develops system-wide goals, objectives, and performance standards that are submitted to the Central Board of Education for review and modification

or approval. These goals, objectives, and performance standards form the basis for similar formulations by key administrators. Their plans are submitted to the General Superintendent and/or Regional School Boards for review and modification or approval. A status report conference is held at midyear to alert both the reviewer and the staff member to problems, and, if necessary, to modify performance standards because of emergencies, changes in assignments and responsibilities, or important shifts in school system priorities or financial resources which sometimes occur during the school year. The key administrator collects "evidence" of attainment of the performance standards for each objective for presentation during the year-end review and evaluation conference.

The Executive Performance Review System contains an incentive pay component which has not been implemented, however, because of the financial constraints confronting the Detroit school system. If implemented, the incentive pay system will provide a means of identifying and systematically rewarding top level executives who have demonstrated superior performance in administrative duties. Such a system will create an environment in which the key administrative staff will be motivated to attain a higher performance level as a group and as individuals, and it will provide meaningful encouragement to top level executives to maintain high levels of performance.

The incentive pay component of the Executive Performance Review System reflects the leading edge of executive compensation and organizational management technology. The concept of incentive pay is relatively straightforward: executives who perform exceptionally well

will be compensated for their efforts; executives who do not meet their performance standards will be directed toward appropriate training and other support services and most likely will not receive salary increases. Under the incentive pay component, there would no longer be regular yearly salary increases. Rather, executives performing at proper and superior levels would be compensated based on past executive salary raises, current economic factors, and the budgetary ability of the Board of Education to pay. See Attachment 2.

Management Academy

In 1977, the General Superintendent issued A Call To Action, a charge to the entire Detroit Public Schools community to join in the implementation of planned educational improvement. Realizing that the school system was neither performing at its full potential nor preparing future leaders to anticipate and respond effectively to rapidly changing and increasingly complex environmental and educational forces, the General Superintendent proposed a Detroit Public Schools Management Training Academy "to improve the performance of all administrative staff--from school department head through the General Superintendent," by offering "training in leadership and decision making, planning and organizing, and supervision and appraisal."

Planning for the Management Academy commenced almost immediately after A Call To Action was published. Those planning efforts moved from abstract discussions to reality when the school district acquired a building and officially opened the Detroit Public Schools Management Academy on January 1, 1979.

The Management Academy was based on the following: (1) recognition of a genuine need for management training and development throughout the Detroit Public Schools; (2) training for individual managers to learn skills, attitudes, and behaviors necessary for carrying out their job responsibilities more effectively and efficiently; (3) a problem solving philosophy which would permeate the design and execution of management training; (4) involvement of an extensive array of school system and community talents and resources; (5) participation by all present and future administrators of the school system in Academy training; (6) completion by each present administrator of the initial required training sequence within four to five years; (7) recognition of the need to change the "culture" of the school system; (8) recognition of the need for the Academy to be an integral part of the school system's organizational development program; and (9) recognition that the improvement of the education of students and the quality of work life for school personnel can be accomplished by refining the management skills of system administrators and supervisors at the central, regional, and local school levels.

The initial content for the Management Academy program was determined by the following: (1) a review of management development programs of educational agencies and business and industry, (2) management training needs identified by several school system sources over the past few years, and (3) management training experiences conducted by the Detroit Public Schools at regional and central offices. The training content addressed the definition, nature, scope, process, and character of management, characteristics of organization structure, problem solving and decision

making, organizing and coordinating human and physical resources, establishing program controls, appraising staff performance, leadership and team building, interpersonal relationships, and communication skills.

The Management Academy currently offers a wide variety of management development opportunities for administrators in both the cognitive and affective areas. The following management development components have been implemented for the system's managers:

Required Seminars in which all school system managers participate in order to facilitate the coordination and integration of human and physical resources. The focus is on helping leaders to influence positively the actions and behavior of others. Required seminar topics, content, and format are based on long and short range system needs. The topics covered include Situational Leadership; Organization Structure of the Detroit Public Schools; School Manager and the Law (disciplinary hearings, due process, and just cause); Financial Management and Budgeting Process; Planning for Improved Achievement; Corrective Discipline; and Performance Appraisal.

Elective Seminars are offered based on the management needs identified by the General Superintendent, his key staff, seminar participants, and the Academy staff. Examples of elective offerings are Leadership Development; Planning and Development; Supervision and Staff Appraisal; Interpersonal, Group Process, and Communication Skills; Organizing for Management; Problem Solving and Decision Making.

Elective Seminars were developed this year around the theme "Managing

Human and Personal Resources" to complement and expand concepts developed in Required Seminars. Topics identified are based on feedback from participants who attended management development seminars and critique meetings held during the 1979-80 school year. Topics include Supervision of Instruction; Evaluating and Improving Teacher Performance; School Improvement--Change Processes and Effective Schools; Defusing Confrontation Situations; Overcoming Resistance to Change, Improvement and Participation; Motivation of Human Behavior; Working with Gifted Students; Effective Speaking Skills for the School Manager; Management-Leadership, the Human Connection; Delegation--Why, How, and When To Do It; and Speed Reading and Memory Control.

Request Seminars are specially designed by the Academy staff and participants for work units or school leaders. If, for example, a school manager wishes to improve team relationships or resolve a problem peculiar to his/her unit, the Academy staff will design and conduct a seminar that will respond to that need.

Critical Issues Seminars are conducted periodically in areas needing special attention. These seminars are invitational to administrators or supervisors, according to the nature of the issue, and are designed to increase staff awareness of vital issues. Issues considered include Equal Educational Opportunity, Desegregation, School Attendance and Student Achievement, and Equal Employment Opportunity.

Institutional Development Activities focus on system-wide renewal efforts in management. This task may include research on the management process, long-range planning, development of new organizational

relationships, executive training, executive and middle management selection processes, or the development and implementation of a professional management system, linking performance appraisal to the attainment of agreed upon objectives.

Promotional Pool Seminars are offered for persons who are now candidates for the principalship. These seminars include Organizational Structure, Stakeholder Management, Statistical Reports and Student Records, School Scheduling and Staff Assignment, Budgeting, Purchasing and Inventory Control, Labor Relations, Board Policies and the Negotiated Contract, and Written Communications.

Participants' comments confirm the evaluation of experts from business, industry, and education that our Management Academy has realized all of its major goals during the three and a half years it has been operational.

Underlying the planning and implementation of Management Academy activities is the belief that although training individual managers is essential to bringing about change in the school system, it is only part of the change needed. The literature and our own practical experiences are filled with examples of staff development programs that fail because managers attempt to practice newly gained knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviors within the same organization climate and environment. For training to be effective in any of these organizations, a change in the "culture" or "climate" of the system itself must occur at the top. Once this happens, significant changes begin to take place in (1) the way people make decisions, (2) the way meetings are conducted, (3) the way

people behave toward each other, (4) the way status differential is perceived, and (5) the way the informal system works. As relationships change, authority dynamics, communication networks, status groups, and even friendship cliques are forced to change. See Attachment 3.

Assessment Center

During the past year, an Assessment Center concept has been pilot-tested at the Management Academy. The purposes of the Center are to measure and predict the probability for success of those applying for a particular position (e.g., the principalship position as was pilot-tested); to implement a process that is more objective, valid, and legally defensible than the one that is currently being used; to identify the applicants' areas of strength and areas in need of further development; and to develop a program of improvement to be instituted prior to assignment.

Job analysis data and input from 'exemplary' principals were used to determine the functions and activities required for the position of principal in the Detroit Public Schools. Assessors were trained to observe, record, and evaluate data. Exercises and simulation activities that matched the actual work situation of principals were developed, tested, and revised on assessee and assessor feedback. The exercises and simulated activities addressed the following skills: Leadership, Sensitivity, Problem Analysis, Decision Making, Decisiveness, Organizing and Planning, Flexibility, Oral Communication, Written Communication, and Awareness of Climate.

The Assessment Center is intended to be both objective and formative. Upon request, each assessee receives individual verbal feedback, highlighting areas of strengths and areas in need of further development. Some suggestions may be directed toward training inside or outside the system, or toward on-the-job development under the leadership of persons with demonstrated expertise in the areas. The assessee takes an active part in identifying his or her own needs for further personal and professional development.

Implementation of the Assessment Center has been delayed because the financial problems of the school district have forced the imposition of a hiring and promotion freeze. All vacant principalship positions over the past 18 months have been filled from the "excess administrator pool" that has been 'restocked' through building and program consolidation activities (school closings). See Attachment 4.

Summary

We believe the development and implementation of a fair and formative evaluation system for all administrative personnel to be essential to improving the quality of the administrative function and its impact on the education process. Accordingly, we have instituted the Administrative and Supervisory Performance Appraisal System and the Executive Performance Review System which, between them, provide evaluation of administrators at every level. Both systems stress the joint participation of the appraiser and the appraisee in establishing performance standards and in discussing what can be done when these standards are not met. (Financial

constraints have prevented the implementation of one key feature of the latter system: an incentive pay component.)

Massive change in the administrative environment has been achieved over a three-and-a-half-year period through the participation of administrators in our Management Academy, which in the past year has pilot-tested an Assessment Center concept for principalship candidates. (Financial problems have delayed implementation of the Assessment Center.)

Conclusion

We in Detroit are confident that progress has been made toward finding solutions to long-standing problems related to evaluation of administrative staff performance. We are mindful, as are all members of the Task Force, that many obstacles have yet to be overcome and that we must avoid the traps of "a little learning" or implementing simplistic solutions to complex problems. Because of the obvious effect that staff attitude and performance have upon the ability of a school system to deliver quality education, our efforts in this regard must continue with increased emphasis.

ATTACHMENT 1

ADMINISTRATOR AND SUPERVISORY

PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

SYSTEM

ADMINISTRATOR/SUPERVISOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

A chief goal of this evaluation program is improved performance. Those involved in any phase of the program should emphasize a guidance and counseling approach, the growth and development of the individuals involved, and cooperative planning for increased competency.

The Detroit Performance Review System calls for mutual establishment of performance standards for both appraiser and appraisee. The standards will be integrally related to the objectives of the system, the unit and the appraisee's position description. These important characteristics of our new approach to performance appraisal provide the total management team with a mechanism for keeping staff motivated, interested and committed. To the degree that managers, at every level, begin to practice appropriate coaching, counseling and interpersonal skills, obsolete appraisal behaviors will be discarded so that performance appraisal can become a personal-development experience for those involved.

(Detach this sheet before using the form.)

FORM 4350 (9-80.D)
Revised: 01/82

DETROIT PUBLIC SCHOOLS

47

ADMINISTRATOR/SUPERVISOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM

Detroit Public Schools
Detroit, Michigan

Last Name	First Name	Initial	School Year	File No.
			19_____ - 19_____	

Position Title	School or Department	Region or Division	Date of Assignment to Present Position

AREAS OF STRENGTH:

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT/DEVELOPMENT:

SUMMARY EVALUATION

Pursuant to the provision of the OSAS Agreement, the performance of the above named Administrator/Supervisor is evaluated as:

☐ Over-Target ☐ On-Target ☐ Below-Target

This evaluation has been discussed with me.	Signature of Appraiser	Date
	Title	XXX
Signature of Administrator/Supervisor who is evaluated Date	School, Department, Unit, or Division	XXX
COPIES:	Signature of Department or Unit Head	
White - Office of Personnel		
Blue - Division Head or Region Superintendent	Signature of Division Head or Region Superintendent	
Yellow - Department or Unit Head		
Salmon - Appraiser		
Pink - Appraisee		

FORM 4560 (9-80.5)
Revised 6-/82

ATTACHMENT 2

EXECUTIVE PERFORMANCE REVIEW

SYSTEM

EXECUTIVE LEVEL ASSESSMENT PROCESS

ABSTRACT

The Detroit Public Schools is the nation's 6th largest school district. The effective and strategic deployment of human and tangible resources for the single purpose of educating over 200,000 students is an immense responsibility. The decisions, policies and practices that determine the direction and usage of all DPS resources are issued within the executive level staff. DPS currently has 24 executive level staff members. Although these persons are effectively carrying out the charge, there has not been a systematic design to identify and prepare others to assume this major responsibility.

Research has repeatedly demonstrated that the most important difference between successful and unsuccessful organizations can be traced to the quality of leadership. Therefore the need exists to identify and develop a cadre of persons who have demonstrated their potential to lead effectively. The nurturing and skill refinement of these persons will insure the continued success of this organization.

The Detroit Public Schools is currently seeking funds to facilitate the installation of an Executive Level Assessment Process for the identification and development of quality leadership.

The project objectives are:

1. To provide the district with a selection process for executive level leadership positions which will be criteria based, highly objective and reflective of actual

skills required to function in each of the executive level positions.

2. To identify and further develop the skills and capabilities of those administrators who have the highest potential for success in executive level positions of the school system.
3. To identify a cadre of persons ready to effectively function in the highest leadership positions of the school system.

The essence of this plan is to put into practice what is known about the effective and efficient development and utilization of scarce human resources. Management at the top level will be able to tap its manpower inventory retrieval system and come up with well-qualified candidates for each management vacancy when it occurs. Once piloted, modified and refined, the process will be adopted by the Detroit Board of Education and become the district's personnel procedure for identifing and promoting executive staff.

The facilitating steps include:

1. Job Analysis Review - Identification of skills and activities associated with each position; manpower needs based on the changes in the organizational structure and the projected financial forecast of the district; and the current and anticipated management styles of the school district.
2. Determination of Need - Development of a succession/ replacement chart for the top twenty-five executive positions in the district.

3. Annual Management Review - Process for developing objective-based criteria and the procedures and tools to be used in the selection of those administrators who have the highest potential for advancement compared to their peer group.
4. Training - Identification and implementation of awareness sessions, inservice activities, individual coaching and practice, and additional work experience through job-rotation or internship.

The executive level assessment process:

1. Identifies a target group (Objectively selected building principals and other equivalent administrators).
2. Determines skills required for functioning in executive level positions (Job analysis).
3. Determines the executive level staffing needs of the district (Succession/replacement chart).
4. Identifies potential candidates for the executive level assessment process (Ranking via the annual management review).
5. Matches potential candidates to the district's needs (Further screening process).
6. Develops and refines skills necessary for the executive level candidates (Training/Job Rotation/Internship).

The matching of potential candidates with skills required for executive level positions and the district needs as revealed by the succession replacement chart is a final process step in

the selection of the executive level pool. This step will also identify specific strengths and areas in which further development is needed. The specific skill areas assessed are based on those skills required of executive level staff as confirmed by the job analysis review.

The Director of the district's Management Academy will have the responsibility of developing and coordinating all components of this project. The Director will also insure that appropriate dissemination of the project's design occurs so that replication by other school districts may be considered.

ATTACHMENT 3

MANAGEMENT ACADEMY

Management Development Seminars, 1981-82

The Management Academy schedule for 1981-82 offers a wide variety of management development opportunities for administrators in both the affective and cognitive areas. All components of the Management Academy Plan will be implemented i.e. Required, Elective, Request and Critical Issues Seminars. All registrations must be approved by the individual to whom the registrant has an immediate reporting relationship. Registrations received by the Academy without an approving signature will be returned.

The following descriptive information will assist you in focusing on areas of greatest importance to you.

1. Required Management Development Seminars:

This component is a continuation of Required sessions for all school administrators and supervisors. Last year, principals, directors, assistant principals-in-charge and curriculum administrators were scheduled for Required sessions. The Target group for 1981-82 will include assistant principals, assistant directors, personnel administrators and those persons who were targeted during the 1980-81 school year, but were not able to attend, as well as those who have make-up sessions to complete.

Because of concerns expressed last fall, in addition to feedback gathered from seminar participants, the following changes have been made:

- The number of topics has been reduced from 7 to 5.
- There are two half-day sessions and three full-day sessions.
- All school department heads, unit heads will receive a full day of "Supervision of Instruction" with Dr. Richard Manatt, during the week of November 16, 1981.
- Sessions are arranged so that participants will attend two consecutive Thursdays/Fridays with a break before attending the next two sessions.
- Regions who were scheduled for Thursday sessions during 1980-81 will be scheduled for Friday during 1981-82.

If, in the judgment of the Region Superintendent or Division Head, it is critical for an administrator—not identified in the Target group—to attend Required sessions, preference will be given to this request.

2. Elective Sessions

Elective sessions are open to all system administrators and supervisors on a first come, first serve basis. **A Division Head or Region Superintendent may require administrators to attend Elective sessions. Preference will be given to this request.** Three kinds of Elective sessions will be offered:

Managing Human and Personal Resources

This series is designed to complement and expand on the concepts developed in Required sessions. However, attendance in Required sessions is not a prerequisite to attendance in Elective sessions. Topics identified are based on feedback from participants who attended management development seminars and critique meetings held during the prior school year.

Principalship Promotional Pool

A significant task of the Management Academy is to identify and assist those persons with management potential who aspire to new and more challenging positions. Management development seminars were scheduled last year for candidates who are currently in the promotional pool for the position of principal. Based on positive participant response, these seminars will be offered again this year and will continue to focus on essential skills that are critical to the organization and operation of schools.

Enrollment will be limited to 30 volunteer participants. Each participant must receive written approval from the affected Region Superintendent and or Division Head. The promotional pool status of volunteer participants will not be altered, but participants will acquire necessary skills for effective and efficient school management.

3. Request Sessions

Request sessions which are designed for job-alike work units who have a specific need peculiar to their unit, school or region will continue to be available this year. The Management Academy's goal is to meet particular group needs whenever possible. However, duplication and overlap of topics which are offered in Elective and or Required sessions will be avoided. Management Academy staff present at all Request sessions, unless there is a special request from the group involved for a particular outside consultant.

4. Critical Issues Seminars

Critical Issues seminars have been planned in areas that merit special attention. The purposes of these seminars are to: raise critical questions, develop greater awareness of present and future system needs and motivate system managers to generate new and viable alternatives for identified problem areas. Most Critical Issues seminars are open to all administrators and supervisors in every position classification. From time to time, Critical Issues seminars will be planned for an identified group. In such case, participation will be by invitation only. During the 1980-81 school year, participant attendance and reaction to seminar topics were excellent. Most sessions are held from 4:30 p.m., to 7:00 p.m. This year, a special series of seminars (Sessions 3-6) will be presented with a focus on the status of sex equity: its roots, policies, practices, legislative acts, laws and implications for educators. Session 3 of this series will be held from 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.

Schedule of Required Sessions

for Assistant Principals, Assistant Directors, and Personnel Administrators
Topics, Dates, Outcomes, Consultants
1981-1982

Sessions which follow are for information purposes. **Selection of participants will be made by Region Superintendents and Division Heads.**

Session 1: **SITUATIONAL LEADERSHIP**

Dates:	Cycle 1	Cycle 2	Cycle 3	Cycle 4
Group 1:	Oct. 22	Dec. 10	Feb. 11	April 1
Group 2:	Oct. 23	Dec. 11	Feb. 12	April 2

Time: 8:30 a.m. - 3:30 p.m.

Outcomes: Participants will be able to:
- Identify the characteristics and actions of a leader
- Assess their leadership potential and style
- Determine organizational factors which inhibit and/or promote the emergence of leaders
- Relate leadership skills to the attainment of organization objectives
- Mobilize and utilize team building skills and team leadership to accomplish expected objectives.

Consultants: Florence Hill, Executive Director, Management Academy
Michael Bellovich and Deborah Pugh, Management Training Specialists

Session 2: **PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL**

Dates:	Cycle 1	Cycle 2	Cycle 3	Cycle 4
Group 1:	Oct. 29	Dec. 17	Feb. 18	April 22
Group 2:	Oct. 30	Dec. 18	Feb. 19	April 23

Time: 8:30 a.m. - 3:30 p.m.

Outcomes: Participants will be able to:
- Establish the purpose of staff appraisal
- Develop and use appropriate processes for appraising staff performance
- Conduct pre- and post-observation conferences
- Develop performance expectations and objectives with staff
- Create an environment for performance improvement
- Develop and implement plans for improving staff performance
- Identify marginal performance and provide assistance to the below-average teacher.

Consultant: Drs. Shirley Stow and Richard Manatt, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa

Session 3: **THE SCHOOL MANAGER AND THE LAW**

Dates:	Cycle 1	Cycle 2	Cycle 3	Cycle 4
Group 1:	Nov. 12	Jan. 7	March 4	April 29
Group 2:	Nov. 13	Jan. 8	March 5	April 30

Time: 8:30 a.m. - 12:00 noon

Outcomes: Participants will be able to:
- Specify and use, appropriately, laws affecting students, staff and parents with a resultant decrease in the number of monetary settlements for the plaintiff.

Consultants: Attorneys, Lynne Metty and Ligens Moore, Detroit Public Schools

Session 4: **PLANNING FOR IMPROVED ACHIEVEMENT**

Dates:	Cycle 1	Cycle 2	Cycle 3	Cycle 4
Group 1:	Nov. 19	Jan. 14	March 11	May 6
Group 2:	Nov. 20	Jan. 15	March 12	May 7

Time: 8:30 a.m. - 12:00 noon

Outcomes: Participants will be able to:
- Operationally define planning
- Identify the purposes and kinds of planning
- Determine the planning responsibilities of all system managers
- Agree on the essential steps in the planning process
- Write an effective plan of action

Consultants: Florence Hill, Executive Director, Management Academy
Michael Bellovich and Deborah Pugh, Management Training Specialists

Session 5: **CORRECTIVE DISCIPLINE**

Dates:	Cycle 1	Cycle 2	Cycle 3	Cycle 4
Group 1:	Dec. 3	Feb. 4	March 25	May 13
Group 2:	Dec. 4	Feb. 5	March 26	May 14

Time: 8:30 a.m. - 3:30 p.m.

Outcomes: Participants will be able to:
- Identify staff behaviors that require corrective discipline
- Initiate appropriate disciplinary procedures which are corrective rather than punitive
- Take and keep control when faced with a situation that requires corrective discipline
- Follow legal mandates of Due Process and Just Cause in all disciplinary cases involving corrective discipline.

Consultant: Thomas W. Hill, Senior Partner
The Mangement Education Center, Inc., Whitmore Lake, Michigan

Schedule of Elective Sessions

Dates, Topics, Outcomes, Consultants
1981-1982

MANAGING HUMAN AND PERSONAL RESOURCES

Session 1: **COPING WITH AND ADJUSTING TO EDUCATIONAL CHANGE**

Date/Time: Monday, October 19, 1981 8:30 a.m. - 3:30 p.m.

Outcomes: Participants will:
- Identify factors which impact education today and in the future
- Learn to mobilize and streamline diminishing resources in a collaborative effort
- Agree on essential steps in the educational change process
- View educational change as an opportunity and a challenge for improving the delivery of services to students

Consultant: Dr. Bessie Cobb Howard, Faculty Member, School of Education Howard University, Washington, D.C.

Session 2: **DO YOU REMEMBER . . . THE POLICIES AND PRACTICES OF THE DETROIT PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM**

Date/Time: Monday, November 9, 1981 8:30 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.

Outcomes: Participants will:
- Explore the most often forgotten and neglected Detroit Public Schools' policies and practices
- Agree on the systematic recall and use of identified policies and practices
- Make a fingertip file of critical school policies

Consultant: Dr. Florence Jacque, Deputy Superintendent, Division of Support Services

Session 3: **SUPERVISION OF INSTRUCTION—HELPING TEACHERS TO IMPROVE INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES**

Date/Time: Monday, December 7, 1981 8:30 a.m. - 3:30 p.m.
Monday, December 14, 1981 8:30 a.m. - 3:30 p.m.
(Continuous Sessions)

Outcomes: Participants will:
- Apply learning theory to classroom practices
- Analyze and evaluate instructional plans and practices
- Utilize effective strategies for pre- and post-observation conferences
- Differentiate between effective and ineffective teaching behavior
- Positively confront and change ineffective teaching behavior

Consultant: Deborah Pugh, Management Training Specialist Detroit Public Schools Management Academy

Session 4: **EDUCATING THE GIFTED IN THE REGULAR CLASSROOM; USING AVAILABLE RESOURCES**

Date/Time: Monday, January 11, 1982 8:30 a.m. - 3:30 p.m.

Outcomes: Participants will:
- Identify techniques and cognitive activities designed to challenge the gifted in the regular classroom setting
- Design, implement and expand Gifted and Talented Programs in their respective schools

Consultant: Roger Taylor, Gifted Education Specialist, Former Director, South Suburban Chicago Area Service Center for Gifted, Chicago, Ill.

Session 5: **STAKEHOLDER/DECISION MAKING**

Date/Time: Tuesday, February 2, 1982 8:30 a.m. - 3:30 p.m.

Outcomes: Participants will:
- Define Stakeholder Management
- Identify Detroit Public School stakeholders
- Agree on the importance and appropriate use of stakeholder input
- Apply stakeholder concepts to the day-to-day decision making process

Consultant: Dr. Robert Terry, Organizational Leadership Inc., Ypsilanti, Michigan

Session 6: **POWER READING—SKILL DEVELOPMENT FOR SCHOOL MANAGERS**

Date/Time: Monday, February 15, 1982 8:30 a.m. - 3:30 p.m.

Outcomes: Participants will:
- Break the subvocalization necessity
- Optimize the use of their minds in the reading process
- Double their original reading rate with improved comprehension and longer retention
- Learn special approaches to both pleasure and informational reading

Consultant: Elaine Nome Connelly, Director, The Reading Institute, Developmental Reading for Schools and Industry, Dearborn, Michigan

Session 7: **WRITTEN COMMUNICATION SKILLS**

Date Time: Monday, May 17, 1982 8:30 a.m. - 3:30 p.m.

Outcomes: Participants will:

- Organize and write better letters, reports and memos
- Develop ideas in writing
- Make written words work to get results.

Consultant: Sterling Jones, Supervisor,
Department of Lanuage Education,
Detroit Public Schools

Session 8: **ALTERNATIVE CAREER PLANS FOR EDUCATORS**

Date Time: Monday, May 10, 1982 8:30 a.m. - 3:30 p.m.

Outcomes: Participants will:

- Assess their skills for present and future career opportunities
- Explore both internal and external career opportunities
- Develop a self-initiated 5-year career plan.

Consultant: Susanne Crawford, Director,
Center for Continuing Education,
Bowling Green University, Bowling Green, Ohio

Session 9: **SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT: CHANGE PROCESSES AND EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS**

Date Time: Wednesday, February 24, 1982 8:30 a.m. - 3:30 p.m.
Wednesday, March 17 8:30 a.m. - 3:30 p.m.
Wednesday, May 19 8:30 a.m. - 3:30 p.m.
(Continuous Sessions)

Outcomes: Participants will:

- Identify and apply training processes which effectively involve staff in developing and implementing school improvement plans and in building ownership and commitment to the plan by staff, students and parents
- Identify and apply strategies for meshing school and outside resources for increased impact on improving pupil achievement
- Identify and apply to school practice the research on effective schools and classrooms to improve pupil achievement
- Identify and apply strategies to change and improve the school learning climate, e.g., instructional leadership, staff expectations, emphasis on student achievement and increasing pupil time on task.

Facilitator: Dr. Stuart Rankin, Assistant Superintendent,
Research, Planning and Evaluation,
Detroit Public Schools

Consultants: Representatives from the Detroit Public Schools (including successful school principals)
Wayne County Intermediate School District
Institute for Research on Teaching at Michigan State University
Wayne State University

PRINCIPALSHIP
PROMOTIONAL POOL SEMINARS

Open Only to Principalship Promotional Pool Candidates

Session 1: **ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE**

Date/Time: Monday, January 25, 1982 8:30 a.m. - 3:30 p.m.

Outcomes: Participants will be able to:

- Cite the major objectives of organization design
- Operationalize the language of organization charts (chain of command, unity of command, span of control, reportability)
- Identify roles, responsibilities, authorities and relationships of positions on the Detroit Public Schools organization chart
- Relate their school/department/division, role, responsibility, authority to the role, responsibility, authority and position of other persons/departments/divisions
- Develop and use a functional organization chart for their school/department/division

Consultants: Florence Hill, Executive Director, Management Academy
Deborah Pugh and Michael Bellovich, Management Training Specialists

Session 2: **STAKEHOLDER MANAGEMENT**

Date/Time: Monday, February 1, 1982 8:30 a.m. - 3:30 p.m.

Outcomes: Participants will be able to:

- Define Stakeholder Management
- Identify Detroit Public School Stakeholders
- Agree on the importance and appropriate use of Stakeholder input
- Apply Stakeholder concepts to the day-to-day decision making process.

Consultant: Dr. Robert Terry, Organizational Leadership, Inc., Ypsilanti, Michigan

Session 3: **STATISTICAL REPORTS AND STUDENT RECORDS**

Date/Time: Monday, March 1, 1982 8:30 a.m. - 3:30 p.m.

Outcomes: Participants will be able to accurately prepare and use required student forms and records related to:

- Class Reports
- Teacher Service Reports
- Attendance Report – Form 537
- Student Accident Report
- Fourth Friday Membership, Personnel and Program Statistics
- Internal Auditing and School Operations Procedures
- Student Code of Conduct

Consultants: Harry Goldstein, Assistant Director, Transportation and Administration, Region 3
Elizabeth Gresham, Secretarial Coordinator, Region 3
Salem Nahhat, Director, Internal Audit and School Operations
Richard LeMoyne, Internal Audit and School Operations
Charles Wells, Divisional Director, Pupil Personnel Services

Session 4: **SCHOOL SCHEDULING AND ASSIGNMENT OF STAFF**

Date/Time: Monday, March 8, 1982 8:30 a.m. - 3:30 p.m.

Outcomes: Participants will be able to

- Allocate teacher service
- Schedule program offerings
- Allocate appropriate classroom space
- Prepare a daily instructional schedule
- Make appropriate staff assignments
- Prepare teacher preparation-period schedule
- Develop an annual calendar
- Develop registration and closing procedures
- Construct a master schedule
- Develop a reorganization plan

Consultants: Dr. Eloise Anderson, Assistant Principal, Cass Technical High School
John Mosley, School Community Relations Administrator, Region 2
Glen Forhan, Principal, O.W. Holmes Elementary School
Middle School Consultant To Be Selected

Session 5: **BUDGETING, PURCHASING AND INVENTORY CONTROL**

Date/Time: Monday, April 19, 1982 8:30 a.m. - 3:30 p.m.

Outcomes: Participants will be able to:

- Develop a school budget
- Develop a budget summary
- Interpret the computer budget printout and accurately record expenditures
- Complete requisitions and other required budget forms
- Maintain an accurate inventory of equipment and supplies
- Measure budget plans against actual results, determine reasons for deviation and take remedial action
- Forecast budget needs

Consultants: Thomas Howell, Budget Director, Office of Finance
Charles Frankel, Business Manager, Region 6
John Urbank, Director, Office of Purchasing
Julian Bass, Director, Office of Payroll
Ferd Hall, Director, Office of Equal Employment Opportunities and Contract Relations

Session 6: **LABOR RELATIONS, THE NEGOTIATED CONTRACT, BOARD POLICIES AND PROCEDURES, AND THE COURT ORDERED DESEGREGATION MANDATE**

Date/Time: Monday, May 3, 1982 8:30 a.m. - 12:00 noon

Outcomes: Participants will be able to:

- Analyze and interpret negotiated contracts with relevance to and emphasis on local school operations
- Review Board personnel policies and procedures
- Review and analyze the critical components of the Court Ordered Desegregation Mandate

Consultants: Lenora Thomas, Director, Office of Labor Affairs
Sheldon Sofen, Administrative Assistant, Office of Program Development

Session 7: **WRITTEN COMMUNICATION SKILLS**

Date/Time: Monday, May 17, 1982 8:30 a.m. - 3:30 p.m.

Outcomes: Participants will be able to:

- Organize and write better letters, reports and memos
- Develop ideas in writing
- Make written words work to get results

Consultant: Sterling Jones, Supervisor, Language Education Department

CRITICAL ISSUES SEMINARS

Session 1 **EDUCATING THE URBAN STUDENT IN THE TRANSITIONAL 80'S**

Date/Time: Monday, November 2, 1981 4:30 p.m. - 7:00 p.m.

Outcomes: Dr. Robert Green calls poverty "the unfinished business of the nation." In recent years, many positive and commendable efforts have been made to bring new life to the "inner city." But the fact remains that our schools are more than 80% Black and the majority of our students come from families that are at or below the poverty level. Unless there are drastic changes, cities like Detroit may become fully populated by economically deprived minority groups. There are no simple solutions. But, those solutions that are identified will have, as a major component, the continued improvement and impact of effective schools.

This seminar will focus on problems of educating the urban student and suggest some strategies that schools may use to effectively challenge and educate urban students.

Specifically, this seminar will deal with:

- Unemployment and its impact on educational, social and economic inequality
- Education and the American Dream
- Opportunities and challenges for educators in the 80's and beyond.

Consultant: Dr. Robert L. Green, Dean, College of Urban Development, Michigan State University, Lansing, Michigan
Dr. Melvin Chapman, Executive Deputy Superintendent, Detroit Public Schools

Session 2: **WHAT'S GOOD ABOUT SCHOOLS... "TOOTING YOUR OWN HORN"**

Outcomes: For the past ten years, public schools have received increasing criticism for perceived failures to educate students in social and cognitive skills. Critics cite as examples of failure, the inability of a significant number of students to read and compute at an acceptable level; falling test scores; high levels of teenage unemployment and unacceptable social behavior exemplified by school disruptions, lack of effective student discipline and increased school vandalism and violence. The threat of vouchers and legislation to permit parents to shop around for their choice of public and or private schools looms in the future.

Participants in this seminar will:

- Focus on the positive aspects of public schools
- Discuss what's right with education and public schools in general
- Learn about the research and documentation which support the claim that "public schools are doing the job and doing it surprisingly well"
- Identify ways of getting the good news to internal and external publics

Consultant: Howard Hodgkinson, President, National Training Laboratories, Arlington, VA and Adjunct Professor, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan

Facilitator: Florence Hill, Executive Director, Management Academy

Session 3: **SEXISM IN AMERICA—A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE**

Date/Time: Monday, January 25, 1982 7:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m.

Focus: This first seminar of the series will review the historical background of male and female relationships with particular emphasis on past programs and practices leading up to the present day. Participants will receive information relative to:

- Sexism—Definition and Overview
- Current Issues in the Sexism Debate
- Title IX, E.R.A., and Other Legislation
- Ideas for Educators

Presenter: The Honorable Shirley Chisholm, Congresswoman, United States House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Facilitator: Dr. Arthur Jefferson, General Superintendent, Detroit Public Schools

Session 4 **ROLE AND GENDER IDENTIFICATION OF THE SEXES**

Date Time: Monday February 22, 1982 4:30 p.m - 7:00 p.m.

Focus: This session of the seminar series will focus on the cultural and social practices which produce role differences and identification between the sexes with particular emphasis on cultural expectations for males and females at home, school and in the workplace. Participants will receive information relative to:

- Cultural and social conditioning of males and females
- The myth of male superiority
- Role expectations of males and females in the home, the workplace and society in general
- Ideas for Educators

Presenter: Dr. Anne Briscoe, Director of Biochemistry, Department of Medicine, Harlem Hospital Center and, Assistant Professor of Medicine at New York University

Facilitator: Mrs. Zodie Johnson, Superintendent, Region 5, Detroit Public Schools

Session 5 **CHANGING PLACES: MEN AND WOMEN IN TRANSITIONAL OCCUPATIONS**

Date Time: Monday March 15, 1982 4:30 p.m - 7:00 p.m.

Focus: Session 5 of this series will focus on changing roles and expectations for men and women in the workplace with emphasis on the full utilization of human resources to improve institutional and corporate productivity

The presentation will address:

- Role identification and occupational choices–the woman's place
- Obstacles to shared leadership and teamwork–economic roots of sexism
- Skill acquisition, mobility, and corporate goals
- Ideas for Educators

Presenter: Dr. Steven A. Marglin, Professor of Economics, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Facilitator: Mr. Benjamin Bernoudy, Assistant Superintendent Region 3, Detroit Public Schools

Session 6 **EDUCATION AND THE POTENTIAL FOR FULL UTILIZATION OF HUMAN RESOURCES**

Date Time: Monday April 26, 1982 4:30 p.m - 7:00 p.m.

Focus: This last session of the series will focus on programs and practices in the public schools.

Specific issues to be addressed are:

- What are the jobs of the future?
- What kinds of counseling is needed for students?
- What evidence do we have of full implementation of the Title IX legislation in public schools?
- Ideas for Educators

Presenter: S. Martin Taylor, Director, Michigan Employment Security Commission, Detroit, Michigan

Additional Consultant to be Selected

Facilitator: Mrs. Patricia Petress, Director, Career Education, Detroit Public Schools

Sessions 3-6: Special Critical Issues Seminar Series

BARRIERS TO ACHIEVEMENT AND PRODUCTIVITY – THE TITLE IX CONNECTION

We are concerned with how America can strengthen its ability to compete in the world, how we can improve our productivity and regain our economic leadership. While we most often focus on investment, equipment and technology, the way we use our human resources is equally important.[1]

Females represent one-half of the nation's population, or one-half of the available pool of talent that can contribute to our growth and production. Studies show that women generally represent 1 to 2 percent of senior managers in any occupation. That means that 98 to 99 percent of our top managers are chosen from 50 percent of the total pool of available talent and expertise. Shall we be satisfied to draw from and encourage higher achievement in skills and abilities from 50 percent of the nation's human resources and not undertake a major exploration on how to gain access to the under-used half? This is not a female problem, but rather a problem of social and economic productivity with far-reaching implications for the school system, the city, and the nation.

Last year, the Soviet Union graduated just under 300,000 engineers. We graduated 50,000. In 1970, 80 percent of all patents issued by the U.S. Patent Office originated in the United States. In 1979, the number had slipped below 60 percent, and continues to decline. Eight out of ten patents awarded in the electronics area in the last five years have been granted to the Japanese. In 1980, 40 percent fewer people obtained degrees in mathematics than in 1970. About the same fall-off was seen in most engineering fields in this country.[2]

Why is this important? Because technological breakthroughs, new products, new services and new applications mean economic prosperity. The ones who will suffer the consequences of our loss of technological leadership today and five or ten years from now will be the young people who are presently in our schools. We must utilize the energies, abilities, the genius of both male and female. We cannot afford to under utilize the limitless potential of one-half of the human race.

The Management Academy is pleased to offer this special series of Critical Issues Seminars which will explore the status of sex equity, its historical roots, policies, practices, legislation and laws; and suggest some strategies for redesigning edcational programs and practices which will provide equality of educational opportunity, increased productivity and effective use of all human resources.

[1] Shirley Young, Executive Vice President, Grey Advertising Inc., Director Dayton Hudson Corp., 1981. (From speech when she accepted the Catalyst Award for Outstanding Women Directors.)

[2] William M. Agee, Renaissance in Technology. A Way Out of the Wilderness, The Detroit News, Sunday, June 7, 1981.

ATTACHMENT 4

ASSESSMENT CENTER

Description - Assessment Center Concept

I. What Is The Assessment Center Concept?

The Assessment Center Concept consists of performance-based exercises that realistically exemplify the actual work activities and environment of a given target population. All exercises developed and used are based on a comprehensive job analysis of the functions, duties, activities, and responsibilities necessary for success in the position being considered.

Trained assessors, who are currently holding or have held the position for which assessees are applying, use reliable instruments, procedures, and assessment techniques to observe and record assessee behavior. In observing and recording assessee behavior, assessors focus their attention on specific skills that have been determined as essential to an identified position.

Assessees are evaluated by assessor consensus based on objectively recorded data. Personal bias and judgmental statements are not acceptable in determining assessee performance. Anything not observed and not recorded will not become a part of the assessor consensus session.

Assessees receive individual feedback on their performance and participate in developing a personal-professional improvement plan.

II. What Are The Purposes Of An Assessment Center?

To measure and predict the probability for success of those applying for a particular position. (This pilot testing deals with the principalship position.)

To implement a process that is more objective and valid and legally defensible than the one that is currently being used.

To identify the applicant's areas of strength and areas needing further development and to develop a program of improvement to be instituted prior to assignment.

III. What Has Been Done In Developing A Situationally Relevant Assessment Center Process For Detroit Public Schools?

Used job analysis data and input from principals to determine the functions and activities required for the position of principal in the Detroit Public Schools.

Developed exercises and activities that match the actual work situation of principals.

Trained assessors to observe, record, and evaluate data.

Tested and revised exercises and procedures based on assessee and assessor feedback.

Used consultant help from Pinellas County, Florida, schools; Director of Personnel, Montgomery County, Maryland; and Wayne County Intermediate School District.

IV. What Skills Will Be Assessed?

Leadership

Sensitivity

Problem Analysis

Decision Making

Decisiveness

Organizing and Planning

Flexibility

Oral Communication

Written Communication

Awareness of Climate

V. Who Is Eligible To Participate?

Applicants who satisfy preestablished criteria for the position announced. For the reliability testing phase, assessors and assessees will be selected from the positions (current and former) of principal and assistant principal.

VI. What Happens To Data About Assessee Performance Gathered During Reliability Testing Phase?

These data will be shared only with the affected assessee, after which all data relating to assessee will be destroyed.

VII. What Sort of Feedback Will Assessees Receive?

Each assessee, who requests it, will be scheduled to receive individual verbal feedback. This feedback will highlight areas of strengths and areas needing further development. Some suggestions may be directed toward

training, either inside or outside the system, or on-the-job development under the leadership of persons with demonstrated expertise in the area. The assessee will take an active part in identifying his or her own needs for further personal and professional development.

VIII. How Will The Detroit Public Schools Use The Assessment Center Concept?

The Detroit Public Schools will use the Assessment Center process in conjunction with other pre-assessment criteria. Prior to acceptance for Assessment Center evaluation, the principalship applicant must be aware of the following procedures:

1. When there are vacancies for the position of principal, a job announcement will be posted in all work locations.

2. A letter indicating interest in the position of principal must be submitted before the closing date shown on the job announcement.

3. The Detroit Public Schools Personal Information Form must be completed, returned, and reviewed to determine whether applicant satisfies all professional, certification, and educational experience requirements.

4. A personal profile is prepared for each applicant who meets the criteria indicated in 1 and 2 above. The profile includes the Personal Information Form, letters of recommendation from present and past immediate superiors (maximum of 5), and evidence of participation in seminars, workshops, school community activities and college courses that are related to principalship requirements, duties, and responsibilities.

5. Specially selected and trained administrators who have held the position of principal review and rate each applicant on a scale of 1 to 7 in identified areas.

6. Applicants receiving the highest rating will be invited to participate in the Assessment Center Evaluation Process as described in I-VII.

7. The number of Assessment Center participants will be determined by Human Resources Development's forecast of the system's current need for principals.

8. Assessment Center participants receiving the highest rating in the 10 skill areas, listed under IV, will be recommended for principalship vacancies.

THE ST. LOUIS SCHOOL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM: A LOCAL SOLUTION TO A NATIONAL PROBLEM

Ronald Stodghill
Interim Superintendent
St. Louis Public Schools

The School Partnership Program: Needs and Benefits

The establishment of the St. Louis School Partnership Program was a local response to problems that confront most urban school systems. Of these problems, one of the most important is the schism that divides the public elementary and secondary schools from other community organizations, such as business, cultural, and higher education institutions. Throughout the country, major corporations and universities are recruiting fewer city high school graduates. The unemployment rate for minority youth in urban areas is the highest for any one group seeking employment. Clearly, confidence in the quality of public education has declined--and not only on the part of the surrounding community. Students and teachers themselves question the relationship between course work and the skills that outside institutions demand. Teachers need the opportunity to learn the latest advancements in their field and how to apply them in the classroom. The consequences are clear. Graduates of urban high schools are less competitive with their suburban counterparts when seeking employment or placement in higher education. The Partnership Program, then, is a local solution to the national problem of bridging the gap between the public schools and community resources.

In a system that enrolls 59,000 students, of whom 80% are black and 20% are white, the St. Louis School Partnership Program has also provided support services in the desegregation of the St. Louis schools. A goal of Partnership programs is to mix students from segregated schools with students of another race and to enhance the ability of integrated schools and specialty programs, such as magnet schools, to attract and maintain a favorable racial mix for students and staff. The Partnership Program also reduces racial isolation by providing students with the opportunity to visit business and cultural sites outside their neighborhoods, as well as to work with business, cultural, and university personnel of another race. This involvement of prestigious businesses, cultural institutions, and universities in the Partnership Program indicates to the community that civic leaders support the desegregation process and want to hold the community together. This past year, the administration for the Partnership Program expanded the number of programs to include students from five St. Louis County Districts who are participating in a Voluntary Metropolitan Desegregation Plan.

The programs are designed to address the Board of Education's priorities: strengthen academic achievement, assist in staff development, raise teacher morale, reduce racial isolation, improve student behavior and attitudes, and promote better relations with the community. This means benefits for all Partnership participants. For students, the Partnership programs demonstrate how information and skills acquired in school are applied in different work situations; they provide information about careers and employment, as well as supplementary materials unavailable in

the classroom; and they show that metropolitan business people and personnel care about them and their future. For teachers, the programs strengthen skills by pairing them with experts in their field, reinforce classroom presentations, improve the attitudes and behavior of their students, and raise morale by providing support from fellow professionals. For business people, the Partnership programs provide an opportunity to contribute to the education of tomorrow's work force and to demonstrate their dedication to making St. Louis a better community.

The Development and Growth of the School Partnership Program

In St. Louis, the School Partnership Program began early in 1979 when the Danforth Foundation provided funds for the Board of Education to hire Dr. Roger Perry of Washington University as a consultant. At the time, planning for the desegregation of the St. Louis Public Schools was underway. With the assistance of Superintendent Dr. Robert Wentz, Dr. Perry initiated the first Partnership programs in fall, 1979, with approximately ten pilot programs during 1979-80. In recruiting corporate sponsors for these first programs, Dr. Perry made presentations to Civic Progress, a group of 29 St. Louis based companies, and obtained introductions from the Regional Commerce and Growth Association to other potential corporate sponsors. Thus, the St. Louis School Partnership Program was initiated by the school system and without funding from a Chamber of Commerce or a corporate group. The subsequent recruitment of businesses was accomplished by contacting individual companies. The task was time consuming but ultimately successful. Initially, there was some consideration of using an Adopt-a-School approach

in which a school would be paired with a single company. Although that was attempted in a few instances, it was abandoned as a formal method of recruitment when resistance to this approach appeared in the corporate community.

During 1980-81, there were 140 programs with 62 community sponsors, of which 50 were businesses. Approximately 6,000 students participated. During this past year, the Partnership Program experienced dramatic growth with 350 programs and a total of 1,811 sessions. One hundred institutions in the business, cultural, and university communities participated in partnerships that served 12,669 students from grades K-12 in 84 schools. An additional 30 Partnership programs involved 1,500 county students.

A recent administrative reorganization in the St. Louis Public Schools has consolidated all of the programs that involve the business community, including Vocational Schools, Career Education, the Work-Study Program, the Community Schools, and the Partnership Program. A Corporate Advisory Board of Chief Executive Officers has been formed to advise the Associate Superintendent who supervises this unit. This reorganization acknowledges the important role which the business community should have in improving urban public education.

Although different national models exist, the St. Louis School Partnership Program is unique in the way it has concentrated on using business expertise to reinforce the teacher's curricular goals and in the breadth of its programs that include cultural agencies, universities, and colleges as sponsors. These unique achievements of the Partnership Program have received national recognition. In 1981, the National Association of

Industry-Education Cooperation awarded its Utilization Award to the Partnership Program. More recently, the American Council of Life Insurance has awarded the administration of the Partnership Program a contract to write a handbook for its member companies that will encourage and assist them in initiating or improving partnerships with local high schools. In May, 1982, the Partnership's Sister Cities Program received a Special Youth Award from Sister Cities International and the Readers Digest Foundation. The Partnership Program also has been included in the Project Data Bank of the President's Task Force on Private Sector Initiatives. And each month the Partnership Program office receives inquiries from across the country.

Funding

The funding for the School Partnership Program has come from three sources: federal, state, and local. The budget for this past year was approximately $350,000. The federal contribution paid the salaries of full-time staff persons and a portion of the contracted services used for programs with nonbusiness sponsors. The state's share, from a desegregation budget, was used primarily to pay the salaries of part-time staff and all other contracted services. The balance came from the Board of Education's desegregation budget to pay the Program's operating costs and to provide teachers' stipends for planning activities after school hours.

It is important to recognize that the Partnership Program can generate enough income to pay for itself. During 1980-81, the first year the Program had a full-time staff, the in kind contributions, matching

funds, and grants totaled $160,000. The tally for the current year has not been completed yet, but since the number of programs has more than doubled, one can assume that the total for in kind contributions will increase considerably. Also during this past year, the Partnership Program has received a minimum of $16,000 in matching funds from the cultural agencies which sponsored programs. The Partnership Program has collaborated with some of these agencies in the preparation of grant proposals by providing information and by promising in kind contributions when grants are awarded. These grant proposals total approximately $150,000. As a result of a recent court ruling, these in kind contributions and matching funds may be used by the Board as part of its matching contribution to the State's share of desegregation costs. The Board, therefore, not only receives services for students which it could not otherwise afford, but also receives a return in real dollars. Although the Partnership Program does not request funds or materials from participating businesses, it has on occasion received materials; for example, a local television station, after participating in a Partnership program with the mass media specialty, offered the program editing equipment valued at $3,000. In terms of its funding, then, the School Partnership Program demonstrates that it can pay for itself by way of services provided and income generated.

How Partnership Programs Are Developed

Partnerships in Business

The development of a school/business partnership is a cooperative

venture in which the teacher, business persons, students, and Partnership staff all have key roles. A description of the method used to develop such a partnership follows.

The Partnership Program is voluntary, with principals at all grade levels being invited to take advantage of the services offered by the Partnership staff. When a principal accepts this invitation, a member of the Partnership staff meets with a teacher or group of teachers whom the principal has identified. Together they explore ways in which an outside resource person could reinforce the material which the teacher presents in the classroom. The staff person then drafts a two- or three-page proposal outlining a series of program sessions with suggested topics and activities. The teacher may draft this proposal, but is not required to do so. The teacher, however, must review and approve the proposal before the Partnership staff presents it to a potential sponsor.

The next step is for the Partnership staff to recruit a business that will agree to have its employees work in the classroom with the teacher and students. Businesses are recruited in a variety of ways; but for the most part, in large corporations the person in charge of public relations or community affairs is contacted. A telephone call requesting an appointment to discuss the Partnership Program is usually successful because the business person rarely declines this form of initial contact. (Direct mail efforts have been less successful.) After successful partnerships have been established with some well known companies, credibility with others is easier to establish. The attitude seems to be: "If Monsanto or Pet, Inc. is involved, it must be a legitimate operation."

In the initial approach to the company, it is essential to specify what is wanted from the company and to be able to explain the proposal in fifteen minutes. It must be stressed that the proposal is a draft subject to change. If the company's resources are sufficient, the participation of more than one employee in the program may be suggested. Often the content of the program will require the expertise of different people from several departments within the company, with one of them serving as the company's coordinator for the program. When the company agrees to participate, the teacher should be brought in to discuss the final draft of the program with the participants. This is a crucial stage in the program's development, in that the principal participants are meeting for the first time, with teacher and business person deciding together what they want to accomplish in the program. During this process, the Partnership staff play an important catalyst role, drawing on past experience with other programs to suggest approaches that work, yet allowing the teacher to maintain control of the program. Indeed, the process requires considerable diplomacy and finesse.

When the program's content and the logistical details have been worked out, the staff person from the Partnership Program continues to provide liaison services and to monitor the progress of the program. It is not uncommon for the original schedule to change in order to accommodate the resource person's changing work schedule. In most programs, this has not been a major problem; in fact, such flexibility in scheduling has been an attractive feature in the program for business sponsors. The average program includes six weekly one-hour sessions. At the conclusion

of each program, an effort is made to provide a recognition ceremony so that the teacher and students may express their appreciation.

This schematic outline becomes meaningful when activities and outcomes of specific programs are delineated. For instance, a Partnership Program at one middle school involved a classroom of sixth and seventh graders and the public relations firm of Aaron D. Cushman and Associates. The Vice President/General Manager of Cushman and an account executive planned a program in conjunction with a teacher to teach students skills needed to conduct a successful public relations campaign. The program had two stages: in the first, the Cushman representatives came into the classroom four times to explain various functions of a public relations firm, showing how various media are used, how research is conducted and how the economics work. In the second stage, the class of thirty students was divided into three teams of ten students each. Each team became an agency, choosing a name, designing a logo for itself, and selecting a student account executive and an art director. The teacher decided that each agency would receive an imaginary budget of $2,500 to develop a public relations campaign using a "Clean Up the Neighborhood" theme. In computing the cost of their campaign, students were required to keep a ledger and to pay a salary to themselves, as well as to the teacher when consulted. Cushman representatives came in periodically over a four-week period to serve as additional consultants. The students knew that on a specific date each agency's work would be judged by an outside team of neighborhood representatives and members of the Mayor's staff, resulting in one agency being given the account.

The students used their time to write press releases and design posters, T-shirts, and other promotional materials. Incidentally, the students' campaigns coincided with an actual city-wide campaign to clean up the city, and the Mayor came to the classroom to congratulate the students on their effort to clean up their neighborhood; these students had a rare opportunity to see representatives of the media in action when accompanying TV and newspaper reporters interviewed them. At the conclusion of the program, each agency presented its campaign to a panel of outside judges. Although only one agency was given the account, all the students received certificates designating them as account executives. In this single project, students used skills directly related to language arts, social studies, mathematics, and art. Working as a team, the students employed organizational skills to complete a sophisticated project and amazed the representatives from Aaron D. Cushman with the results.

A second Partnership program involved high school students, the LaSalle Park Redevelopment Corporation (a subsidiary of Ralston Purina), and a Neighborhood Marketing Service specializing in housing in redeveloped neighborhoods. The latter agency asked the Partnership Program if it would be possible to have students serve as guides for public tours of city neighborhoods during National Preservation Week. Preparation for their guide duty provided students with a unique educational opportunity. In an intense two-week program, the students met with representatives from Ralston Purina to discuss that corporation's role in redeveloping a neighborhood, toured several neighborhoods undergoing restoration, and

met with the president of the neighborhood association and with developers, to discuss the economics of redevelopment. From these sessions, the students compiled the information they needed to develop a tour and commentary for the Preservation Week activities. A class of county students taking a course on American cities joined with city students for two of the classroom sessions and then returned during Preservation Week as guides for the tour. For the last session, a newspaper editor specializing in neighborhood redevelopment interviewed the students for the purpose of featuring their project in his publication. By the end of the program, the students had received instruction in urban sociology, economics, communications, and leadership.

Some Partnership programs, such as banking programs emphasizing mathematics and life skills, easily lend themselves to replication. This past year, fourteen banks participated in programs with class levels ranging from grades 5-8 to high school. For the most part, all of the programs covered basically the same topics, but each had its own activities, often suggested by the participating bankers. One bank, for example, had students write advertising slogans that were later used as radio commercials. Another provided an opportunity for eighth graders to spend the morning at various work stations in the bank. One class went through a formal loan application to borrow money for a class project while another opened an account in order to deposit its savings for a class trip.

On one occasion, a Partnership Program between a class of thirty high school students and a local television station evolved into a course.

The fact that the high school had a quarter system made it possible to design a ten-week curriculum. The objective of the class was to have three teams of students write and produce a fifteen minute newscast. Each week different representatives from the news department--editors, producers, anchor persons; news, sports, and weather reporters--came to the school to teach their respective specialties. The teacher supervised the students' work and taught additional sessions. At the end of the quarter, each news team had its presentation videotaped, and portions were broadcast as a feature story during the station's evening newscast. Students received grades based on their performances.

The most notable example of a single company's commitment to the Partnership Program has been Monsanto's partnership with Southwest High School. Since its beginning in 1980, the number of programs and participants have grown. Monsanto has provided seventy staff members to participate in programs in accounting, biology, chemistry, physics, algebra, computer science, office machines, mathematics, and study skills. At the end of the school year, Monsanto sponsors a two-week summer program in computer science for selected students who go to Monsanto for three hours each morning.

Several businesses, including Monsanto, have provided programs designed for teachers and administrators. McDonnell-Douglas has opened its management seminars to certain high school administrators and is allowing teachers to enroll free in courses, such as computer science, mathematics, and writing, which it provides for its employees. Monsanto sponsored an organizational development specialist to work two days a

month throughout the year with a cadre of administrators, department heads, and counselors at a high school, to restructure the way that school operated and made decisions. In the same school, Anheuser-Busch provided twenty management consultant days to train key high school administrators to work effectively in the new structure.

All of these programs are examples of how business partnerships can improve the education of students at all grade levels. The possibilities inherent in the programs are limited only by our imagination and willingness to make them work.

Partnerships in the Arts and Humanities

The development of Partnership programs in the arts and humanities in St. Louis provides a particularly fine example of what we mean by a local solution to a national problem. In 1964, the Commission on the Humanities reported: "The task before us in the humanities is no overnight job. For the ills of our schools there is no quick cure. But there is no reason for dismay or delay." In 1980, the Rockefeller Foundation's Commission on the Humanities, referring to the 1964 report, was less sanguine: "There has been delay, and there is now ample reason for dismay." In stating the priorities for American education and cultural life in the 1980s, the Rockefeller Commission's mandate is clear: educators must reaffirm the value of the humanities and there must be collaboration among educational and cultural institutions and the sources of support for the humanities. While the Commission's Report in 1964 led to the creation of two large federal agencies--the National Endowments for the Humanities and for the Arts--the 1980 Report emphasizes the importance of local leadership and

collaboration. The Commission proposes a "shared responsibility" because it believes that "the humanities' best hope for the future lies in collaboration among many individuals and institutions."

The St. Louis School Partnership Program has developed a local strategy for this shared responsibility and collaboration in strengthening the arts and humanities in education. The mechanism for this collaboration is relatively simple. It is absolutely essential that there be a liaison between teachers in the classroom and the education staff of a cultural agency. This liaison must understand the needs of teachers and be able to work quickly and effectively with resource people in satisfying these needs. Even if a cultural institution wants to cooperate with the schools, its proposals and suggestions stand a good chance of dying a quiet death in the system's bureaucratic channels. There is a need, therefore, for a person who has contacts with cultural agencies, who is aware of the needs of teachers, and who has their trust. The cultural educator appreciates and values this ready access to the schools. Just recently a curator wrote to me: "As important as funding is, it was the dedication and skill of the Partnership personnel that were most responsible for the success of our joint venture in the St. Louis Public Schools." Kits and pre-packaged materials are not a satisfactory substitute for this person-to-person contact.

In 1980-81, the School Partnership Program collaborated with ten cultural agencies including the Art Museum, the Symphony, Dance St. Louis, the Missouri Botanical Garden, and Young Audiences. The result was the establishment and implementation of 52 programs in which 2,514 students

from 32 schools participated. The average cost for each student participating in a program was $12.00. For 1981-82, the figures were even more impressive. This past year, 16 cultural agencies provided 120 programs with 6,000 participants from 65 schools at an average cost of $8.50 per student. Thus, the number of students, schools, and programs more than doubled this past year while the cost per student declined.

The School Partnership Program has collaborated with cultural institutions in five major ways:

1) disseminating information about cultural resources available to schools

2) developing education programs that reflect the curricular goals of teachers

3) forming outreach programs that bring cultural resources into the classroom

4) cooperating in funding efforts and in developing pilot programs

5) reducing racial isolation of students and improving professional development and staff morale in the schools

Brief examples of Partnership collaboration for each of these categories follow.

Dissemination of Information About Cultural Resources Available to Schools. The Partnership Program staff has worked with curriculum committees and with individual teachers at all grade levels to assist them in using available cultural resources to achieve their instructional objectives. For the past two years the Partnership Program has published and distributed to teachers over 5,000 copies of a Teachers' and Administrators' Guide to

Educational Programs at Cultural Institutions Throughout Greater St. Louis. This Guide is a compilation of the materials and services, with information on their cost and availability, which twenty cultural institutions offer to teachers. Many of these materials can be obtained by mail and are free to the user. The Guide is an improvement over the individual brochure prepared by each agency which is easily misplaced or which may never reach the teacher. To facilitate the use of the fifty-two page Guide, the Partnership Program sponsors a Cultural Resources Conference at which teacher representatives from every school can meet with educators from the twenty cultural institutions to discuss the resources available to them.

Development of Education Programs that Reflect the Curricular Goals of Teachers. A goal of the Partnership Program is to bring teachers and the education staffs of cultural institutions together to create programs that will make the arts and humanities an integral part of the "three R's." With budget cuts and increased attention being given to teacher accountability and to the "back to basics" movement, a danger exists that teachers and administrators will view the humanities as expensive frills instead of, in the words of the 1980 Commission on the Humanities, "part of a basic education, linking literacy to cognitive and critical skills." Teachers who do recognize that the arts and humanities should be an integral part of the "basics" will be more selective in choosing the cultural resources that help them achieve their curricular goals. But a large number of teachers, less familiar with the arts and humanistic disciplines, will abandon any effort to teach them. There is evidence already of such a

trend, with attendance figures from local cultural institutions showing a student decline. The result of this trend is an isolation that neither teacher nor cultural agency desires. The Chairman of the Education Department of the Missouri Botanical Garden identified a key problem when she remarked that "while the St. Louis Metropolitan area is rich in cultural resources, it is often difficult to 'make the connection' between institutions and an individual teacher. That we do not reach more teachers and/or receive input from teachers as to how we can more effectively meet their needs is one of our greatest concerns."

The Partnership Program has provided the needed "connection" and has been effective in redesigning and developing resources that are relevant to the teacher's curricular goals. At the Missouri Botanical Garden, for example, the Education Department expressed an interest in providing programs that went beyond their usual offerings in science. The Partnership staff identified interested teachers and participated with them in planning sessions to develop a series of interdisciplinary programs. One such program was in creative writing: the Japanese Garden was used to teach students about the aesthetics of Japanese culture and to inspire students in their writing of haiku poetry. The best of their work was published by the Garden as a book, with illustrations and cover done by the students. Poetry selections from the book were transferred by the Garden's calligrapher to cards and placed in appropriate settings for public display during the Japanese Festival. This project so motivated the teacher that this year she involved all of her classes in the project. This has led to the publication of a second and larger book.

Other programs at the Garden involved the use of carnivorous plant exhibits as an inspiration for science fiction writing and the use of the herb garden to illustrate the importance of gardens and plant life in early American colonial literature. For next year, plans are under way for a series of programs for use in world culture classes that will focus on the relationship of plants to the economic, social, and political structure of different cultures. Without the liaison services of the Partnership Program, these programs would not have been developed and used in the schools.

Formation of Outreach Programs that Bring Cultural Resources into the Classroom. At some cultural institutions, contact with the schools has been very limited. Prior to its Partnership Program, the McDonnell Planetarium, for example, had offered Saturday classes to the public, tours of exhibits, and shows in the star chamber that were not designed specifically for children. Also prior to the Partnership Program, this important institution was under utilized as a learning resource. The Partnership Program persuaded and then assisted the Planetarium in the development of a multi-session program on the solar system in which part-time teachers from the Planetarium worked with teachers in the schools' classrooms to reinforce presentations made to students at the Planetarium.

At the Missouri Historical Society, a private institution, there were tours for students, some slide kits, and occasional one-time presentations for use in the classroom. As a result of Partnership Program collaboration, a program on local history allows middle school students to use materials taken from the Society's collections, such as reprints

from newspapers, journals, city directories, and diaries, for classroom projects on St. Louis history. The Society's Education Department staff members go to the classroom to assist teachers and students with the projects.

This type of classroom involvement enables education departments in cultural agencies to better understand the needs and resources of their clientele. As a result, these outreach programs will be increasingly important in the future.

Cooperation in Funding Efforts and in Development of Pilot Programs. The majority of these cultural programs have been financed with monies from the contracted services fund of the Partnership Program. This past year approximately $45,000 was expended. Frequently these funds were used to match other sources of funding. As a result, the St. Louis Public Schools receive in kind contributions and matching funds that equal or exceed the amount expended for the program. Last year, for example, four of ten institutions reported in kind contributions and matching funds to the Partnership Program that totaled $20,000. There have been several instances in which matching funds would have been lost had there not been an agency in the schools which could respond quickly and effectively to these opportunities. Last year a reallocation of funds by the Missouri Arts Council provided for three artist-in-the schools programs for city schools, but the identification of schools, teachers, and students, as well as paperwork, had to be completed within three days to qualify for the grant. The Partnership Program was there to accomplish the task. On another occasion, the Mid-American Dance Company received a grant to give

performances and workshops in the public schools. The grant was in danger of being lost when the director could find no school official to assist him in identifying interested schools and locating matching funds. Again, the Partnership Program provided the needed assistance.

The Partnership staff also has collaborated with cultural institutions in the preparation of grant proposals by providing information, in kind contributions, and matching funds. The Partnership Program, for example, worked with the St. Louis Art Museum to secure funding from the Missouri Arts Council for three elementary schools to participate in the Museum's Arts in the Basic Curriculum (ABC) program. This allowed the Partnership Program to use its available funds as a match to sponsor three additional schools for the ABC program. A Partnership program developed with the Missouri Historical Society, and piloted this past year, has resulted in a $70,000 grant proposal to NEH that has been well received in the initial review.

Once pilot programs are developed and refined, they are made available to all the school districts in the St. Louis metropolitan area.

Reduction of Racial Isolation of Students and Improvement of Professional Development and Staff Morale in the Schools. We have discovered, for example, that many of the programs' students, for the most part minority members, have never been to the Art Museum or to the Missouri Botanical Garden, both of which are located in the city and are considered to be major tourist attractions. An evaluation of students attending the ABC program at the Art Museum revealed that 85% of the students wanted to return to the museum in the future.

This past year, students from a city high school have collaborated with a county high school, a participant in the voluntary desegregation plan, in a writing project at the Missouri Botanical Garden. The project is the editing and illustrating of student writings to be made into booklets.

In short, Partnership Program activities in all five categories cited above have contributed to improved communications between cultural agencies and the St. Louis Public Schools, as well as made available more relevant education programs in the arts and humanities.

The University Partnership

Of all the Partnership Programs, those with universities and colleges are the least developed. The decentralized administration of most universities and the independent status of the faculty make recruitment and coordination of programs difficult. We have found that private institutions are more likely to participate in programs without charging for contracted services. Faculty from Washington University and St. Louis University have participated in programs in foreign languages, chemistry, biology, and architectural drawing. Partnership programs with these institutions will continue to develop, but probably at a slower pace than those with businesses and cultural institutions.

Evaluation

The evaluation of the Partnership Program has taken two forms: two evaluations of the Partnership Program as a whole, as well as evaluations of individual programs. The most recent evaluation was completed this

spring by Washington University. The results indicated that the Partnership Program has achieved its goals of improving academic achievement, reducing racial isolation, contributing to the professional development of teachers, improving student and staff morale, and making the community's perception of the public schools more positive:

1) 96% of the people who responded to the evaluation survey indicated a willingness to participate in the program next year.

2) 87% of the sponsors responding to the survey indicated that their participation was very worthwhile or extremely worthwhile.

3) 97% of the teachers indicated that they would like the same or more participation in next year's Partnership Program.

4) 62% of the teachers indicated that the Partnership Program was very useful or extremely useful in giving them more expertise in their subject area.

5) 60% of the sponsors had a higher or much higher opinion of the students in the St. Louis Schools after participating in the Partnership Program and fewer than 4% had a lower opinion of students.

Both sponsors and teachers, then, overwhelmingly endorsed their participation in the Partnership Program and indicated a desire to see it continue. A more limited evaluation of student opinion indicated a high degree of satisfaction, with 58% of them reporting that they were "more" or "much more" likely to attend school on the days of Partnership Program sessions.

The quantitative evaluation of particular programs to measure academic achievement is difficult because each program is individualized. Such an evaluation has been possible in some cases where the program has been standardized and large numbers of students have participated. At

McDonnell Planetarium, for example, a comparison of pre- and post-test scores of 600 elementary and middle school students indicated an improvement of 16%. Tests given to students in banking programs have also shown significant gains. One bank administered its own test to students to determine whether its participation in the Program was worthwhile. The results were so positive that the bank immediately decided to participate next year.

A sampling of remarks from sponsors, teachers, and students made during interviews or in written evaluations is equally encouraging:

Sponsors

"I was very impressed with the quality of students. They were polite, mature, and had their heads on straight. They were perfect guests. They are a plus for the school district." (IBM)

"The kids really tried. Some were understanding things I didn't until college." (Sverdrup-Parcel)

Teachers

"A problem among students has been that their aspirations were not high enough. In this program they saw that it takes maturity, drive and hard work--not just smarts--to reach goals."

"I thought it [the Program] was very relevant. It related to our understanding of our economic system."

"We [sponsor and teacher] developed the outline together and geared it to what I was doing in the course."

Students

"When I first got here I was getting bad grades in social studies because I didn't understand it. But when we went down there they explained it better. I went from a D to a B."

"I saw three successful engineers that came from my background. They were all young and came from different schools. I thought like wow! I can do that! They set an example. You want to pattern yourself after them."

In short, the School Partnership Program is viewed as an impressive success.